



Agenda & minutes

Full Council meeting of
Tuesday, 12 July 2016

Portsmouth City Council

A MEETING OF THE COUNCIL will be held at the Guildhall, Portsmouth on Tuesday 12 July 2016, commencing at 2.05pm (or immediately following the conclusion of the Extraordinary Council meeting if later) and all Members of the Council are hereby summoned to attend to consider and resolve upon the following business:-

Agenda

- 1 Members' Interests**
- 2 To approve as a correct record the Minutes of (Pages 1 - 22)**
 - the Annual Council meeting held on 17 May 2016;
 - the Adjourned Council meeting held on 17 May 2016.
- 3 To receive such communications as the Lord Mayor may desire to lay before the Council, including apologies for absence.**
- 4 Deputations from the Public under Standing Order No 24.**
- 5 Questions from the Public under Standing Order 25. (Pages 23 - 24)**
- 6 Appointments**
- 7 Urgent Business - To receive and consider any urgent and important business from Members of the Cabinet in accordance with Standing Order No 26.**
- 8 Notice of Motion Referral - Consultation (Pages 25 - 26)**

To receive and consider the attached referred motion and response recommendations by the Cabinet held on 9 June 2016 (minute 12 refers).
- 9 Approval of UK Municipal Bond Agency's Framework Agreement (Pages 27 - 44)**

To receive and consider the attached report and recommendations of the Cabinet held on 9 June 2016 (minute 13 refers).
- 10 Safer Portsmouth Partnership Plan 2016 (Pages 45 - 78)**

To receive and consider the attached report of the Cabinet held on 8 July 2016 (recommendations to follow).

11 Cancelled Meetings - Notice of Motion Referral (Pages 79 - 80)

To receive and consider the attached referred motion of the Governance & Audit & Standards Committee held on 1 July 2016 (response recommendations to follow).

12 Appointment of Independent Persons (Pages 81 - 84)

To receive and consider the attached report of the Governance & Audit & Standards Committee held on 1 July 2016 (recommendations to follow).

13 Proposed Amendments to the Arrangements for the Assessment, Consideration and Investigation of Complaints against Councillors (Pages 85 - 94)

To receive and consider the attached report and Appendix 2 of the Governance & Audit & Standards Committee held on 1 July 2016 (revised Appendix 1 of the report and the recommendations to follow).

14 Reviews undertaken by the themed scrutiny panels (Pages 95 - 100)

To receive and consider the attached report of the Scrutiny Management Panel held on 8 July 2016 (recommendations to follow).

15 Notices of Motion

(a) Portsmouth Naval Base Property Trust

Proposed by Councillor Alicia Denny
Seconded by Councillor Colin Galloway

The city council is aware of the huge contribution which Portsmouth Historic Dockyard makes to the city, both in terms of its maintenance of the Royal Navy's heritage and drawing tourists to view its magnificent attractions, and wishes this to be continued and expanded.

However, this charitable property company was formed in 1986 between the Ministry of Defence and Portsmouth City Council. Out of 12 trustees, the city council now has only two representatives rather than the six which would be equitable. As councillors, these two members have some accountability to the council but the other trustees are responsible to no one apart from the Charity Commission.

Where the property trust leases premises within the Historic Dockyard to charities, such as HMS Warrior and the International Boatbuilding Training College, these subsidiary organisations can be put in difficult financial and practical situations due to the approach taken by the landlord.

The City Council requests the Leader of the council to write to the Charity Commission asking whether it is willing to facilitate action to

force the property trust to revisit its constitution to increase its representation of city councillors, improve its working relations with the separate charities operating with the Historic Dockyard and to be more accountable for its actions, especially bearing in mind its vast amount of public funding.

- (b)** Proposed by Councillor Ben Dowling
Seconded by Councillor Hugh Mason

"We are proud to live in a diverse and tolerant society. Portsmouth City Council condemns racism, xenophobia and hate crimes unequivocally and believe such attitudes and actions have no place in our city. We will not allow hate to become acceptable.

We ask the council's Cabinet to ensure local bodies and programmes have the support and resources needed to fight and prevent racism and xenophobia.

Portsmouth City Council would like to reassure all people living in Portsmouth that they are valued members of our community."

- (c) Moving the Yomper**

Proposed by Councillor Jennie Brent
Seconded by Councillor Luke Stubbs

The National Museum of the Royal Navy plans to centralise Portsmouth's military museums in the Dockyard and as a result that the Marines' Museum is due to vacate its current home by 2019.

The Yomper statue has graced Southsea seafront for many years, serving as a reminder of both the Falklands War and of the Marines' historical association with Eastney.

No decision has been made about where the Yomper will be sited once the museum moves, however council feels it must put on record its opposition to it being removed from the seafront. It therefore resolves to direct the Chief Executive to write to the Director General of the National Museum of the Royal Navy to seek assurances there will be extensive consultation before any relocation and to express a clear preference that the statue remain as it is.

- (d) The Lodge**

Proposed by Councillor Steve Pitt
Seconded by Councillor Darren Sanders

This Council recognises the valuable contribution made by Art & Soul Traders to the cultural and community life of our city and also their restoration of The Lodge in Victoria Park.

After a robust and ultimately successful dialogue in 2012, a new

agreement was reached between this Council and the operators, to secure their future, which has resulted in both increased income for the Council and extra flexibility for the operators, who have continued to thrive.

The Council therefore supports, in principle, the continuation of the lease for Art & Soul Traders as tenants of The Lodge and asks the Cabinet Member for PRED to ensure that happens.

16 Questions from Members under Standing Order No 17. (Pages 101 - 102)

David Williams
Chief Executive

Members of the public are now permitted to use both audio visual recording devices and social media during this meeting, on the understanding that it neither disrupts the meeting or records those stating explicitly that they do not wish to be recorded. Guidance on the use of devices at meetings open to the public is available on the Council's website and posters on the wall of the meeting's venue.

Full Council meetings are digitally recorded.

Civic Offices
Guildhall Square
PORTSMOUTH
4 July 2016

Agenda Item 2

17 May 2016

1

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL held at the Guildhall Portsmouth on Tuesday, 17 May 2016 at 10.00 am

Council Members Present

The Right Worshipful The Lord Mayor
Councillor Frank Jonas (in the Chair)

Councillors

Dave Ashmore	Hugh Mason
Simon Boshier	Lee Mason
Jennie Brent	Stephen Morgan
Ryan Brent	Gemma New
Yahiya Chowdhury	Robert New
Alicia Denny	Steve Pitt
Ben Dowling	Stuart Potter
Ken Ellcome	Will Purvis
John Ferrett	Darren Sanders
Jim Fleming	Lynne Stagg
David Fuller	Luke Stubbs
Colin Galloway	Julie Swan
Paul Godier	Linda Symes
Scott Harris	David Tompkins
Steve Hastings	Gerald Vernon-Jackson
Hannah Hockaday	Steve Wemyss
Suzy Horton	Matthew Winnington
Lee Hunt	Rob Wood
Donna Jones	Tom Wood
Ian Lyon	Neill Young
Leo Madden	

The Lord Mayor welcomed everyone to the meeting.

31. Vote of Thanks to Retiring Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress

It was

Proposed by Councillor Donna Jones

Seconded by Councillor Gerald Vernon-Jackson

That a vote of thanks be given to the retiring Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress.

It was RESOLVED unanimously that the council places on record its sincere thanks to Councillor Frank Jonas and Mrs Patricia Jonas for their outstanding service to the city for a second term as Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress during their year of office.

That the council expresses its great appreciation of the fine qualities which Councillor Frank Jonas has once again brought to the conduct of the business of this Council, his devotion to duty and the distinction and

goodwill with which he carried out the many and various duties of the office of Lord Mayor.

That the Council also places on record its gratitude to Mrs Patricia Jonas who also gave her untiring support and help as Lady Mayoress to the Lord Mayor.

That this resolution be engrossed and be presented to Councillor Frank Jonas and Mrs Patricia Jonas at this ceremony.

The retiring Lord Mayor was presented with the Council's gift of an engrossed scroll which signifies the Council's appreciation of his time in office.

32. To elect the Lord Mayor for the Ensuing Municipal Year

Councillor Gerald Vernon-Jackson nominated Councillor David Fuller for election to the office of Lord Mayor for the ensuing municipal year. The nomination was seconded by Councillor Donna Jones.

There being no other nominations, the Lord Mayor put the proposal which was CARRIED unanimously and he declared Councillor David Fuller duly elected Lord Mayor.

Councillor David Fuller then left the chamber with the retiring Lord Mayor to don the Lord Mayor's robes and the chain of office.

33. Investiture of the new Lady Mayoress

Mrs Patricia Jonas, the retiring Lady Mayoress, invested Mrs Leza Tremorin, the new Lady Mayoress with the chain of office, after which the new Lady Mayoress signed a document of office witnessed by the City Solicitor.

34. New Lord Mayor takes the Chair

Councillor David Fuller took the chair and thereupon made and subscribed the Declaration of Acceptance of Office witnessed by the City Solicitor.

35. Presentation of the Keys of the City

The Lord Mayor received the Keys of the Fortress of Portsmouth presented to him by Major Damir Zamboni.

36. Presentation of the Portsmouth Sword

The Lord Mayor received the Portsmouth Sword presented to him by Lieutenant Commander Adrian Hopwood Royal Navy, First Lieutenant of HM Naval Base.

37. The Lord Mayor returns thanks to the Council

The Lord Mayor took this opportunity to thank members of the Council for his election and gave a short speech.

38. To appoint the Deputy Lord Mayor for the ensuing Municipal Year

Councillor Simon Boshier nominated Councillor Ken Ellcome as the Deputy Lord Mayor for the ensuing municipal year. This nomination was seconded by Councillor Steve Wemyss.

There being no other nominations, the Lord Mayor put the proposal, which was CARRIED unanimously and he declared Councillor Ken Ellcome duly elected as the Deputy Lord Mayor and he made and subscribed the Declaration of Acceptance of Office. This was witnessed by the City Solicitor. The Chief Executive said that Councillor Ellcome would be supported by his Deputy Lady Mayoress, Mrs Jo Ellcome. The Deputy Lady Mayoress then made and subscribed the Declaration of Acceptance of Office. This was witnessed by the City Solicitor.

39. Appointment of Chaplains to the City Council

The Dean of Portsmouth, the Very Reverend David Brindley and Pastor Dan Harman were appointed as Chaplains to the City Council.

40. Appointment of the New Lord Mayor Cadets

To support the Lord Mayor in his year in office, a team of cadets will be on hand. The Lord Mayor wished to show his appreciation by presenting each of them with a certificate.

The following cadets received their certificates at the meeting:-

Leading Cadet Emily Day, Cadet Sergeant Daniel Reed, Royal Marine Voluntary Cadet Corps, Albert Wassenberg, Combined Cadet Force, Cadet Sergeant Elizabeth Faulkner, Hampshire and Isle of Wight Army Cadet Force and Bethany Clark and Rose Craven, St John Ambulance.

The Lord Mayor advised that Cadet Corporal Jack Metcalfe, Air Training Corps and Able Cadet Samuel O'Donnell, Sea Cadet Corps were unable to attend today and would be presented with a certificate by the Lord Mayor at a later date.

41. Presentation of the Freedom of the City of Portsmouth

It was

Proposed by Councillor John Ferrett
Seconded by Councillor Donna Jones

That Honorary Alderman Syd Rapson be formally admitted to the roll of Honorary Freemen of the City of Portsmouth. This was CARRIED unanimously. Honorary Alderman Rapson made and subscribed the Freedom of the City book witnessed by Judge Hetherington.

RESOLVED that Honorary Alderman Syd Rapson BEM ISM be formally admitted to the roll of Honorary Freemen of the City of Portsmouth.

The Lord Mayor presented the freedom scroll to Honorary Alderman Syd Rapson who then gave a short speech of thanks.

42. Presentation of Civic Awards

A representative from the cadets brought forward the civic award badges for presentation. The Lord Mayor presented civic awards to members of the community who had been nominated for their outstanding contribution to the life of the city. The awards were presented to Jean Stanford, Mr Tom Morton, Mr Andrew Pearce and Mr David Stemp.

43. Young Person's Civic Award

A representative from the cadets brought forward the young person's civic award. Nominations for this award were made by members of Portsmouth Youth Voice (formerly known as the Youth Parliament) which represents young people in the city and strives to ensure their voices are heard by decision makers. This year the winner was Mr Peter Marcus who collected his award.

The meeting adjourned at 11.55 am, to be reconvened no earlier than 2.30 pm.

Lord Mayor

MINUTES OF THE ADJOURNED ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL
held at the Guildhall, Portsmouth on Tuesday, 17 May 2016 at 2.50 pm.

Council Members Present

The Right Worshipful The Lord Mayor
Councillor David Fuller (in the Chair)

Councillors

Ken Ellcome	Hugh Mason
Dave Ashmore	Lee Mason
Simon Boshier	Stephen Morgan
Jennie Brent	Gemma New
Ryan Brent	Robert New
Yahiya Chowdhury	Steve Pitt
Alicia Denny	Stuart Potter
Ben Dowling	Will Purvis
John Ferrett	Darren Sanders
Jim Fleming	Lynne Stagg
Colin Galloway	Luke Stubbs
Paul Godier	Julie Swan
Scott Harris	Linda Symes
Steve Hastings	David Tompkins
Hannah Hockaday	Gerald Vernon-Jackson
Suzy Horton	Steve Wemyss
Lee Hunt	Matthew Winnington
Frank Jonas	Neill Young
Donna Jones	Rob Wood
Ian Lyon	Tom Wood
Leo Madden	Neill Young

The Lord Mayor welcomed members to the second part of today's meeting. In particular the Lord Mayor extended a welcome to guests from Duisburg City Council, Volker Mosblech MdB, Deputy Mayor of the City of Duisburg and Janine Schmidt, Mayor's Office, City of Duisburg, from Caen City Council Catherine Pradel-Chazarenc, Deputy Mayor, City of Caen and Lesley Coutts, Head of International Relations and finally Mr Andrew Kelly and colleagues from our sister city of Portsmouth, Rhode Island, USA. The Lord Mayor also welcomed back Councillors Fleming and Madden and extended a welcome to newly elected members Councillors Morgan, Pitt and Wood.

The Lord Mayor also welcomed Honorary Alderman Terry Hall and Honorary Alderman Alistair Thompson to the meeting.

The Lord Mayor read out in full the rules relating to filming council proceedings. He reminded everyone that today's meeting was being filmed from a fixed location camera placed in the chamber with the intention of web streaming the recordings and gave details about the Council's strict rules on when members of the public could and could not be filmed, photographed or recorded.

The Lord Mayor then gave detailed information on the evacuation procedures.

44. Members' Interests

There were no declarations of members' interests.

45. To confirm the minutes of the meetings of the extraordinary and ordinary Council held on 22 March 2016

It was

Proposed by Councillor Donna Jones
Seconded by Councillor Gerald Vernon-Jackson

That the minutes of the meetings of the extraordinary and ordinary Council held on 22 March 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the extraordinary and ordinary Council held on 22 March 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

46. To receive such communications as the Lord Mayor may desire to lay before the Council, including apologies for absence

There were no apologies for absence.

The Lord Mayor drew members' attention to the revised seating plan which had been circulated in the chamber and is effective from this meeting.

The Lord Mayor welcomed Mr Andrew Kelly from our Portsmouth Rhode Island sister link who read out a proclamation from his town council mayor.

A vote of thanks was given by Councillor Lee Mason on behalf of the Council. He thanked Mr Kelly for the proclamation from Portsmouth Rhode Island's town council mayor. He also thanked guests from Portsmouth's twin cities of Caen and Duisburg for sending representatives for their attendance.

The Lord Mayor then reminded members that at the extraordinary meeting on 22 March 2016 it was agreed to admit former Portsmouth city councillor Terry Hall to the roll of honorary aldermen.

The Lord Mayor presented Terry Hall with a framed certificate and Mrs Hall gave a short speech of thanks.

The Lord Mayor said that at the same extraordinary meeting, it was also agreed to admit former Portsmouth city councillor Alistair Thompson to the roll of honorary aldermen. The Lord Mayor presented the certificate to Mr Thompson who responded with a short speech of thanks.

The Lord Mayor then advised members that Councillor Stephen Morgan had been appointed as Deputy Leader of the Labour group.

47. Deputations from the Public under Standing Order No 24

There were no deputations.

48. To elect the Leader of the City Council who will remain in office for four years until May 2020 unless he/she

- (a) resigns from the office
- (b) is no longer a councillor
- (c) is removed from office by resolution of the council.

This is in accordance with the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

It was

Proposed by Councillor Luke Stubbs
Seconded by Councillor Jim Fleming

That Councillor Donna Jones be appointed Leader of the Council.

As there were no other nominations the Lord Mayor declared Councillor Jones as the Leader of the Council.

The Leader thanked colleagues for their support.

49. In accordance with the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, to receive details from the Leader of the Council regarding Cabinet members and portfolios for the ensuing Municipal Year

The Lord Mayor explained that the Council Leader is empowered to determine the number of councillors on the Cabinet and decide portfolios and portfolio remits and to select one of the appointed members to the position of Deputy Leader. The Leader then announced her Cabinet. The names of the Cabinet and opposition spokespersons together with membership of the Health & Wellbeing Board which is in the gift of the Leader was circulated (attached to these minutes as Appendix1).

The Leader advised that her Deputy Leader, Councillor Luke Stubbs would continue in this role and thanked him for the outstanding job he was doing. The Leader also read out the appointments to the Health & Wellbeing Board.

Finally the Leader placed on record a warm welcome to Councillors Jim Fleming, Leo Madden, Steve Pitt, Tom Wood and Stephen Morgan.

Councillor Gerald Vernon-Jackson gave his best wishes to all members of the Cabinet.

RESOLVED

- (1) that Council noted that there will be ten portfolios (including the Leader) for the ensuing municipal year as set out in Appendix 1 attached to these minutes;**
- (2) that Council noted the membership of the Health & Wellbeing Board for the ensuing municipal year also as set out in Appendix 1 attached to these minutes**

The Lord Mayor proposed and the Council agreed to take agenda items 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 together namely proportional representation on committees and panels and consequent appointments of members and standing deputies, chairs and vice-chairs and other appointments.

Councillor Vernon-Jackson proposed that Councillor Ben Dowling should be appointed as a standing deputy on the Langstone Harbour Board and Councillor Jones agreed to incorporate this into the proposal.

It was

Proposed by Councillor Donna Jones
 Seconded by Councillor Luke Stubbs

To adopt the overall political balance and allocation of seats schedule circulated in the chamber and to agree the membership of the committees and panels, standing deputies, chairs and vice-chairs of committees and panels, including appointments and other appointments detailed at agenda items 14 and 15 also circulated at the meeting subject to the change mentioned in respect of the Langstone Harbour Board.

Upon being put to the vote the Council agreed all the appointments.

RESOLVED (1) the total number of seats on committees and panels be divided among the political groups in accordance with Table 1 as set out below.

TABLE 1

Party	# Cllrs	Total seats	Licensing	Planning	Scrutiny Panels, Employment and GAS	SMP
Con	19	34	7	4	19	4
LD	15	27	5	4	15	3
UKIP	4	7	1	1	4	1
Lab	3	6	1	1	3	1
Ind (PG)	1	2	1	0	1	0
	42	76	15	10	42	9

RESOLVED (2) that any other bodies subject to the political proportionality rules be appointed in accordance with the proportions shown in Table 1.

RESOLVED (3) that the following committees and panels be appointed with the membership as shown together with the standing deputies and chairs and vice-chairs where appropriate as indicated.

Licensing Committee

15 Members and 3 standing deputies per group represented
Indicate "Chair" & "Vice Chair" in position column.

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Licensing	Conservative	Vice Chair	H. Hockaday
Licensing	Conservative		J. Brent
Licensing	Conservative		S. Harris
Licensing	Conservative		D. Tompkins
Licensing	Conservative		K. Ellcome
Licensing	Conservative		S. Hastings
Licensing	Conservative		L. Mason
Licensing	Liberal Democrat		S. Pitt
Licensing	Liberal Democrat		D. Ashmore
Licensing	Liberal Democrat		G Vernon-Jackson
Licensing	Liberal Democrat		L. Madden
Licensing	Liberal Democrat		S. Horton
Licensing	UKIP	Chair	J. Swan
Licensing	Labour		S Morgan
Licensing	Independent		P. Godier
Licensing	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	R. Wood
Licensing	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	H. Mason
Licensing	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	D. Sanders
Licensing	Conservative	Standing Deputy	I. Lyon
Licensing	Conservative	Standing Deputy	R. Brent
Licensing	Conservative	Standing Deputy	
Licensing	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Licensing	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Licensing	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Licensing	Labour	Standing Deputy	J Ferrett
Licensing	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Licensing	Labour	Standing Deputy	

Planning Committee

10 Members and 5 standing deputies per group represented
Indicate "Chair" & "Vice Chair" in position column.

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Planning	Conservative	Chair	F Jonas
Planning	Conservative	Vice-Chair	S Harris
Planning	Conservative		K Ellcome
Planning	Conservative		J Brent
Planning	Liberal Democrat		H Mason
Planning	Liberal Democrat		G Vernon-Jackson
Planning	Liberal Democrat		L. Hunt
Planning	Liberal Democrat		S. Pitt
Planning	UKIP		C Galloway
Planning	Labour		Y Chowdhury
Planning	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	T Wood
Planning	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	S Horton
Planning	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	R Wood
Planning	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	D Sanders
Planning	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	L Stagg
Planning	Conservative	Standing Deputy	S Hastings
Planning	Conservative	Standing Deputy	G New
Planning	Conservative	Standing Deputy	D Tompkins
Planning	Conservative	Standing Deputy	
Planning	Conservative	Standing Deputy	
Planning	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Planning	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Planning	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Planning	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Planning	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Planning	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Planning	Labour	Standing Deputy	S Morgan
Planning	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Planning	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Planning	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Planning	Labour	Standing Deputy	

Scrutiny Management Panel

9 Members and 3 standing deputies per group represented
Indicate "Chair" & "Vice Chair" in position column.

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Scrutiny Management Panel	Conservative	Chair	S Boshier
Scrutiny Management Panel	Conservative	Vice Chair	I. Lyon
Scrutiny Management Panel	Conservative		S. Hastings
Scrutiny Management Panel	Conservative		S Harris

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Scrutiny Management Panel	Liberal Democrat		D Sanders
Scrutiny Management Panel	Liberal Democrat		B Dowling
Scrutiny Management Panel	Liberal Democrat		T Wood
Scrutiny Management Panel	UKIP		A Denny
Scrutiny Management Panel	Labour		S Morgan
Scrutiny Management Panel	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	M Winnington
Scrutiny Management Panel	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	R Wood
Scrutiny Management Panel	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	L Madden
Scrutiny Management Panel	Conservative	Standing Deputy	J. Brent
Scrutiny Management Panel	Conservative	Standing Deputy	F Jonas
Scrutiny Management Panel	Conservative	Standing Deputy	
Scrutiny Management Panel	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Scrutiny Management Panel	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Scrutiny Management Panel	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Scrutiny Management Panel	Labour	Standing Deputy	Y Chowdhury
Scrutiny Management Panel	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Scrutiny Management Panel	Labour	Standing Deputy	

Governance & Audit & Standards Committee

6 Members and 3 standing deputies per group represented.
Indicate "Chair" & "Vice Chair" in position column.

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Governance & Audit & Standards	Conservative	Chair	I. Lyon
Governance & Audit & Standards	Conservative	Vice- Chair	S Harris
Governance & Audit & Standards	Conservative		F Jonas
Governance & Audit & Standards	Liberal Democrat		L Madden

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Governance & Audit & Standards	Liberal Democrat		H Mason
Governance & Audit & Standards	Labour		J. Ferrett
Governance & Audit & Standards	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	M Winnington
Governance & Audit & Standards	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	D Sanders
Governance & Audit & Standards	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	R Wood
Governance & Audit & Standards	Conservative	Standing Deputy	D Tompkins
Governance & Audit & Standards	Conservative	Standing Deputy	K Ellcome
Governance & Audit & Standards	Conservative	Standing Deputy	J. Brent
Governance & Audit & Standards	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Governance & Audit & Standards	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Governance & Audit & Standards	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Governance & Audit & Standards	Labour	Standing Deputy	S Morgan
Governance & Audit & Standards	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Governance & Audit & Standards	Labour	Standing Deputy	

Employment Committee

6 Members and 3 standing deputies per group represented.
Indicate "Chair" & "Vice Chair" in position column.

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Employment Committee	Conservative	Chair	D. Jones
Employment Committee	Conservative	Vice Chair	L. Stubbs
Employment Committee	Conservative		J. Fleming
Employment Committee	Liberal Democrat		G Vernon-Jackson
Employment Committee	Liberal Democrat		D Sanders
Employment Committee	Labour		J. Ferrett
Employment Committee	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	M Winnington

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Employment Committee	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	L Stagg
Employment Committee	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	L Madden
Employment Committee	Conservative	Standing Deputy	L Symes
Employment Committee	Conservative	Standing Deputy	S. Boshier
Employment Committee	Conservative	Standing Deputy	S. Hastings
Employment Committee	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Employment Committee	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Employment Committee	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Employment Committee	Labour	Standing Deputy	Y Chowdhury
Employment Committee	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Employment Committee	Labour	Standing Deputy	

Health Overview & Scrutiny Panel

6 Members and 3 standing deputies per group represented.
Indicate "Chair" & "Vice Chair" in position column.

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Health Overview & Scrutiny	Conservative	Chair	J. Brent
Health Overview & Scrutiny	Conservative		G. New
Health Overview & Scrutiny	Conservative	Vice-Chair	D Tompkins
Health Overview & Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat		L Stagg
Health Overview & Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat		L Madden
Health Overview & Scrutiny	UKIP		A. Denny
Health Overview & Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	D Ashmore
Health Overview & Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	B Dowling
Health Overview & Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	L Hunt

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Health Overview & Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	
Health Overview & Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	I. Lyon
Health Overview & Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	H. Hockaday
Health Overview & Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Health Overview & Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Health Overview & Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Health Overview & Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Health Overview & Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Health Overview & Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	

Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny Panel

6 Members and 3 standing deputies per group represented.
Indicate "Chair" & "Vice Chair" in position column.

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	Conservative	Chair	H Hockaday
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	Conservative	Vice-Chair	S. Harris
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat		M Winnington
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat		L Hunt
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	UKIP		A Denny
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	Labour		Y Chowdhury
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	S Pitt

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	B Dowling
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	S Horton
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	S. Hastings
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	G. New
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	I. Lyon
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	J Ferrett
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	

Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel

6 Members and 3 standing deputies per group represented.
Indicate "Chair" & "Vice Chair" in position column.

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Conservative	Vice Chair	D Tompkins
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Conservative		G. New
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Chair	W Purvis
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat		S Horton

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat		B Dowling
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Independent		P. Godier
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	M Winnington
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	D Ashmore
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	H Hockaday
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	K Ellcome
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	

Housing and Social Care Scrutiny Panel

6 Members and 3 standing deputies per group represented.
Indicate "Chair" & "Vice Chair" in position column.

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	Conservative	Vice Chair	G New
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	Conservative		F Jonas
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	Conservative		J. Brent
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Chair	D Sanders
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat		L Madden
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	UKIP		A Denny

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	H Mason
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	M Winnington
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	L Hunt
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	D Tompkins
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Housing and Social Care Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	

Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny

6 Members and 3 standing deputies per group represented.
Indicate "Chair" & "Vice Chair" in position column.

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	Conservative	Vice-Chair	S Hastings
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	Conservative		F Jonas
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	Conservative		I. Lyon
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat		L Hunt
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat		T Wood

Committee/Panel	Group allocation	Position	Nomination
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	UKIP	Chair	S Potter
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	D Sanders
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	S Pitt
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	Liberal Democrat	Standing Deputy	S Horton
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	K Ellcome
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	D Tompkins
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	Conservative	Standing Deputy	
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	UKIP	Standing Deputy	
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	
Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny	Labour	Standing Deputy	

RESOLVED (4) that the following appointments be made for 2016/17 municipal year:

Hampshire Fire & Rescue Authority (3 members)

Requires political proportionality, equating to

1 Liberal Democrat - **Councillor Matthew Winnington**

2 Conservative - **Frank Jonas and Luke Stubbs**

Police and Crime Panel (1 Member)

Membership: **Ian Lyon**

Local Government Association General Assembly (4 Members)

Membership: **Councillor Lee Mason; Councillor Donna Jones; Councillor Rob New; Councillor Gerald Vernon-Jackson**

Portsmouth City Council has up to 4 votes on the LGA, which are usually exercised by the party forming the City Council's political administration.

Langstone Harbour Board (6 Members)

Applying political proportionality rules would equate to;

2 Liberal Democrat - **Councillor Darren Sanders and Matthew Winnington**

3 Conservative - **Councillors Steve Hastings; Ian Lyon; Lee Mason**

1 UKIP - **Councillor Alicia Denny**

Plus 1 standing deputy - **Councillor Ben Dowling**, Liberal Democrat.

RESOLVED (5) that the following appointments be made to the Twinning Advisory Group for the 2016/17 municipal year

To be chaired by the Resources Portfolio holder, with the Lord Mayor performing the deputy Chair role.

6 Members (not proportional)

Councillor Lee Mason (Chair) Resources portfolio holder; Councillor David Fuller (Vice-Chair, ex officio Lord Mayor); Councillor Colin Galloway; Councillor Yahiya Chowdhury; Councillor Hugh Mason; Councillor Lynne Stagg

50. To receive and consider any urgent and important business in accordance with Standing Order No 26

There was no urgent and important business.

51. To approve the following dates for meetings of the Council during the 2016/17 Municipal Year as required under Standing Order 6 and 10(k), to commence at 2.00 pm unless otherwise indicated

It was

Proposed by Councillor Donna Jones

Seconded by Councillor Luke Stubbs

That the dates and times for the Council meetings for the next municipal year (2016/17) as set out at agenda item 17, (subject to the date change identified below), be approved and that the dates for 2017/18 Council meetings also at item 17, be agreed in principle, subject to the date change below.

Dates be amended as follows:

16 17 May 2016

- That 19 July 2016 be moved to 12 July 2016 and that 18 July 2017 be moved to 11 July 2017

Upon being put to the vote this was CARRIED.

RESOLVED that the meetings of the Council be held on the following dates in the 2016/17 municipal year to commence at 2.00 pm unless otherwise indicated.

12 July 2016	17 January 2017 (provisional)
11 October 2016	14 February 2017
15 November 2016	21 March 2017
13 December 2016	16 May 2017 (Annual) (10.00 am)

It was

Proposed by Councillor Donna Jones
Seconded by Councillor Luke Stubbs

That the following provisional Council meeting dates for 2017/18 be agreed in principle subject to later ratification. Upon being put to the vote this was AGREED.

RESOLVED that the following provisional Council meeting dates for 2017/18 subject to later ratification be agreed in principle:

11 July 2017	16 January 2018 (provisional)
17 October 2017	13 February 2018
14 November 2017	20 March 2018
12 December 2017	15 May 2018 (Annual) (10.00 am)

The meeting concluded at 3.17 pm.

.....
Lord Mayor

Cabinet & Opposition spokespersons for 2016/17

Portfolio	Cabinet Member	Group Spokespersons
The Leader	Donna Jones (Leader) (Conservative)	Gerald Vernon-Jackson (Liberal Democrat) Colin Galloway (UKIP) John Ferrett (Labour)
Planning, Regeneration & Economic Development	Donna Jones) (Conservative)	Ben Dowling (Liberal Democrat) Colin Galloway (UKIP) Yahiya Chowdhury (Labour)
Environment & Community Safety	Rob New (Conservative)	Dave Ashmore (Liberal Democrat) Julie Swan (UKIP) Stephen Morgan (Labour)
Culture, Leisure and Sport	Linda Symes (Conservative)	Lee Hunt (Liberal Democrat) Julie Swan (UKIP) Stephen Morgan (Labour)
Traffic and Transportation	Jim Fleming (Conservative)	Lynne Stagg (Liberal Democrat) Stuart Potter (UKIP) Yahiya Chowdhury (Labour)
Adult Social Care and Public Health	Luke Stubbs (Deputy Leader) (Conservative)	Gerald Vernon-Jackson (Liberal Democrat) Alicia Denny (UKIP) John Ferrett (Labour)
Housing	Steve Wemyss (Conservative)	Tom Wood (Liberal Democrat) Stuart Potter (UKIP) Stephen Morgan (Labour)
Resources	Lee Mason (Conservative)	Hugh Mason (Deputy Liberal Democrat) Colin Galloway (UKIP) Yahiya Chowdhury (Labour)
Children's Social Care	Ryan Brent (Conservative)	Rob Wood (Liberal Democrat) Alicia Denny (UKIP) John Ferrett (Labour)
Education	Neill Young (Conservative)	Suzy Horton (Liberal Democrat) Alicia Denny (UKIP) John Ferrett (Labour)

Health & Wellbeing Board *

*The Leader of the Council subsequently ratified the membership as being

Councillor Donna Jones	Leader of the Council
Councillor Luke Stubbs	Portfolio holder for Adult Social Care & Public Health
Councillor Ryan Brent	Portfolio Holder for Children's Social Care
Councillor Gerald Vernon-Jackson	Leader of the largest opposition group
Councillor John Ferrett	Co-opted Member
Councillors Colin Galloway	Standing Deputy

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5



Portsmouth
CITY COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING

QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC AT COUNCIL MEETINGS UNDER STANDING ORDER NO 25

CITY COUNCIL MEETING – 12 JULY 2016

QUESTION NO 1

FROM: MRS JUNE CURD

A grant of £28,000 was paid in for the maintenance of Grafton Street yet there have been cut backs to the services there e.g. they have cut down on wardens and cleaners there.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 8

From CABINET MEETING held on 9 June 2016

Council Agenda Item 8 (Cabinet minute 17)

Notice of Motion Referral - Consultation

At the Council meeting held on 22 March 2016 it was agreed that Notice of Motion (f) was set out on the agenda would not be debated that day but that this would be referred to Cabinet for consideration.

The Notice of Motion proposed by Cllr Vernon-Jackson and seconded by Cllr Sanders stated:

"The City Council has a role to speak up for the people of this city and for this city. The City Council therefore has a duty to respond to consultations that affect services for residents in the City. The City Council regrets the decision by the Council not to reply to consultations that affect services upon which residents of the city rely as this can mean decisions are taken by others that disadvantage local residents."

The following response statement was made by the Leader of the Council for full council:

"The City Council places great importance on consultations particularly by partner agencies such as Hampshire Fire & Rescue Authority. The City Council encourages all of its members, councillors and partners to partake in any consultation in the city. However the City Council does fully respect our partners' position when they are carrying out their own consultation. We do not believe that it is right and proper for the Council to form a position but such that the 42 individual members of the council should form their own individual opinions and formally consult and reply to the consultation as they so wish."

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9

From CABINET MEETING held on 9 June 2016

Council Agenda Item 9 (Cabinet minute 23)

Approval of UK Municipal Bond Agency's Framework Agreement

RECOMMENDED to Council to:

- (1) approve the Council's entry into the Framework Agreement and its accompanying schedules including the joint and several guarantee;**
- (2) delegate authority to the Director of Finance and Information Services as Section 151 Officer and the Deputy Chief Executive as Monitoring Officer to sign those documents, as appropriate, on behalf of the Council;**
- (3) grant the Section 151 Officer delegated authority to agree amendments to the Framework Agreement as appropriate.**

This page is intentionally left blank

Decision maker:	Cabinet City Council
Subject:	Approval of UK Municipal Bond Agency's Framework Agreement, and Joint and Several Guarantee
Date of decision:	9 June 2016 (Cabinet) 12 July 2016 (City Council)
Report by:	Chris Ward, Director of Finance and Information Services (Section 151 Officer)
Wards affected:	All
Key decision:	Yes
Full Council Meeting:	Yes

1. Summary

The Municipal Bonds Agency (the Agency) has been established to deliver cheaper capital finance to local authorities. It will do so via periodic bond issues, as an aggregator for financing from institutions such as the European Investment Bank (EIB) and by facilitating greater inter-authority lending. Further details about the Agency are provided in Appendix A.

The Agency's Framework Agreement sets out the arrangements for borrowing from the Agency and incorporates a joint and several guarantee that requires all local authorities borrowing from the Agency to guarantee the money owed by the Agency to those who have lent it money to fund its loans. Further details about the Framework Agreement and the joint and several guarantee are provided in Appendix B.

2. Purpose of report

This report seeks approval for the Council to enter into the borrowing documents prepared by the Agency.

The Agency requires that local authorities borrowing from it enter into its Framework Agreement. The Agreement includes an accession document confirming that the council has the necessary approvals to sign the Agreement and a joint and several guarantee to those lending money to the Agency in respect of the borrowing of all other local authorities from the Agency. Entering into the Framework Agreement enables the Council to access funding from the Agency as and when required.

3. Recommendations

3.1 The City Council is recommended to:

3.1(a) approve the Council's entry into the Framework Agreement and its accompanying schedules including the joint and several guarantee;

3.1(b) delegate authority to the Director of Finance and Information Services as Section 151 Officer and the Deputy Chief Executive as Monitoring Officer to sign those documents, as appropriate, on behalf of the Council;

3.1(c) grant the Section 151 Officer delegated authority to agree amendments to the Framework Agreement as appropriate.

4. Background

The purpose of the Agency is to deliver cheaper capital finance to local authorities. The Agency is wholly owned by 56 local authorities and the Local Government Association (LGA). The Council is a shareholder in the Agency with a total investment of £150,000.

The Council has limited sources of capital finance available to it. The margin charged by the Public Works Loans Board (PWLB) rose significantly in 2010 and therefore the LGA explored and then, with the support of a number of local authorities, established the Agency as an alternative to the PWLB.

The Agency's Framework Agreement sets out the arrangements for borrowing from the Agency and incorporates a joint and several guarantee that requires all local authorities borrowing from the Agency to guarantee the money owed by the Agency to those who have lent it money to fund its loans. The Framework Agreement incorporates a mechanism to prevent a call under the guarantee by requiring borrowers to lend the Agency money to cover a default by another local authority, referred to as "contributions".

The Council has the power to enter into the Framework Agreement under Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 – the general power of competence. Borrowing under the Framework Agreement will be under Section 1 of the Local Government Act 2003 – the power to borrow.

Acting on behalf of prospective borrowers, a small group of authorities appointed lawyers, Allen & Overy, to review and advise upon the documentation. Allen & Overy instructed counsel to obtain senior opinion on vires and reasonableness.

Counsel raised three key considerations that a local authority must take into account when taking a decision to enter into the Framework Agreement:

- its specific financial position;
- whether or not the council is "reasonably financially robust" i.e. the council can meet the potential demands that the Framework Agreement places upon it; and
- whether it is to the authority's advantage to enter into the Framework Agreement taking into account the advantages and disadvantages of doing so.

5. Reasons for recommendations

Need to Borrow

The Council has a need to borrow of £99 million over the next three years to fund capital expenditure and refinance maturing debt. The Council's gross debt at 31 March 2019 will be £457 million if it undertakes no further borrowing. The Council's estimates its capital financing requirement (CFR) which measures its underlying need to borrow will be £556 million at 31 March 2019. This is set out in the Council's Treasury Management Strategy and summarised in table below:

	2015/16 £'000	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	2018/19 £'000
Borrowing	391,120	387,769	384,417	381,066
Finance leases	4,100	3,479	2,828	2,171
Service Concessions (including Private Finance Initiative schemes)	82,109	79,639	76,456	73,769
Total Gross debt	<u>477,329</u>	<u>470,887</u>	<u>463,701</u>	<u>457,006</u>
Capital Financing Requirement (CFR):				
Opening CFR in 2015/16	403,990	460,132	549,539	558,436
Capital expenditure financed from borrowing	65,413	99,348	19,961	7,144
Minimum revenue provision (MRP)	(9,271)	(9,941)	(11,064)	(10,056)
Closing CFR	<u>460,132</u>	<u>549,539</u>	<u>558,436</u>	<u>555,524</u>
Under / (Over) Borrowing	<u>(17,197)</u>	<u>78,652</u>	<u>94,735</u>	<u>98,518</u>

Use of the Agency will save the Council interest costs; otherwise the Council will use alternative sources of borrowing. Every 0.01 per cent interest saved is worth £9,900. A saving of 0.1 per cent would be worth £99,000. The savings over time may be significant as the Agency's bond pricing improves and institutions such as the EIB lend money to the Agency. For capital investment in eligible sectors, the EIB can offer funding that is significantly cheaper than either the PWLB or bond markets.

The capital programme approved by the City Council on 9th February 2016 includes £99m of capital expenditure financed by borrowing in 2016/17. This includes £66.0m of expenditure on the acquisition of commercial properties to provide an income stream to support the Council's services.

Financial Robustness

The Council's revenue budget and medium term financial strategy demonstrate and set out the financial pressures the Council is under, particularly in light of the funding cuts and uncertainties that changes to the system of local government finance and business rates may bring. Nonetheless, the Council is required to balance its budget and is subject to tight statutory controls and supervision. It is therefore extremely unlikely that the Council will find itself in the position that it is unable to meet the requirements of the Framework Agreement and joint and several guarantee e.g. that it makes contributions if asked.

If the Council were called upon, it has access to PWLB funds at 48 hours' notice if required. Loans made to the Agency under the Framework Agreement as part of the contribution arrangements could constitute capital expenditure because loans to third parties are defined as such under the *(Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003* (as amended). Given that the Agency is likely to recover the amounts owed to it by a defaulting authority and that the contributions are in themselves loans, the impact on the revenue budget is likely to be negligible if the Council is required to make a contribution or called upon under the joint and several guarantee.

6. Risks and Disadvantages of Entering into the Framework Agreement

Exposure to the contribution arrangements and the joint and several guarantee means that entering into the Framework Agreement and borrowing via the Agency is different in nature to borrowing from the Public Works Loan Board, under a bilateral loan facility or through a bond issue in the capital markets.

There are inherent risks associated with the proposed structure, not least the joint and several nature of the guarantee. These are:

- The risk that the Council's guarantee may be called independently of any other Guarantee and for the full amount owing by the Agency under the financing document that is covered by the guarantee (and, therefore, such participating local authority is potentially liable to pay out amounts to the MBA that exceed the amounts borrowed).
- Even if the Council has terminated its Guarantee, it will continue to guarantee the "Guaranteed Liabilities" entered into by the Agency before the termination date. The effect of this is that the Council's liability under its Guarantee may potentially continue in existence for many years after termination.

However, the risks associated with the joint and several guarantee are mitigated by the contribution arrangements. The Framework Agreement is such that the Council's exposure, from a practical perspective, is the requirement to make contributions in the event of a default by another borrower and this exposure is proportional because it is calculated by reference to the amount borrowed by the Council as a proportion of all non-defaulting loans made by the Agency.

The risk of a default by a local authority is deemed to be very low: no principal local authority has ever defaulted on a loan.

The statutory and prudential framework under which local authorities operate is extremely strong and designed to prevent local authorities from over-reaching themselves and becoming insolvent. Key aspects of the framework include:

- Local authorities are prevented from borrowing to fund services by the Local Government Finance Act 1992, which sets out how budgets and the Council Tax must be calculated, particularly Section 31A, 32 and 42A of the Act. These provisions require a budget to be balanced on a cash basis without the use of borrowing.
- Local authorities must comply with the prudential framework established by Part 1 of the Local Government Act 2003 and related regulations, including the Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities published by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA).
- Section 151 Officers have varied powers and responsibilities that result in prudent financial management. For example, if an authority cannot pay its bills as they fall due, he or she must submit a Section 114 report to the Executive / Council, which must be acted upon. A Section 151 officer must also report on the adequacy of reserves and robustness of budget estimates under Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003 and action be taken by the Council to remedy an adverse report.
- A local authority must make a Minimum Revenue Provision ("MRP") to repay debt under the local authorities (*Capital Finance and Accounting*) (*England*) *Regulations 2003*, issued by the Secretary of State under Sections 21 of the Local Government Act 2003 (as amended). This means that a local authority sets aside cash via its revenue budget, sufficient to ensure it can repay its debt.

The Agency's credit assessments, risk management processes and the concentration limits should reduce the possibility that a local authority borrowing from the Agency is likely to default.

Local authorities have access to the PWLB as lender of last resort and therefore can refinance any borrowings from the Agency by the PWLB if it cannot repay its debt to the Agency by other means.

Historically, the Government has intervened when a local authority finds itself in difficulties or the Government deems a local authority to be incapable of managing itself effectively.

For the Council to be called upon to make contributions under the Framework Agreement, let alone be called upon under the joint and several guarantee, all the above controls and protections must fail.

The Local Government Act 2003 provides several key protections to lenders that greatly reduce the possibility that the Agency and therefore the Council would be unable to recover sums owed to it if it is required to make a contribution or pay out under the joint and several guarantee:

- Section 6 provides that a lender is not required to ensure that a local authority has the power to borrow and is not “prejudiced” in the absence of such a power. This prevents a local authority claiming an act was “ultra vires” to side step its obligations.
- Section 13 provides that all debts rank pari passu i.e. have equal status under the law and thus a creditor cannot be disadvantaged by later subordination of that debt by a local authority.
- Section 13 also secures all debts of an authority on its revenues, which is the strongest possible security for a loan as the bulk of a local authority’s revenues are either raised under statutory powers or allocated by the Government.
- Section 13 also provides for a receiver to be appointed by the High Court on application if principal and / or interest greater than £10,000 is outstanding for 60 days.

The Framework Agreement requires that the Agency must pursue any defaulting authority to the extent that if it does not do so promptly, borrowers can force it to do so. Furthermore, the Framework Agreement provides for a strict application of the proceeds of any debt recovered by the Agency from a defaulting authority.

There is a risk that the Agency does not observe its obligations under the Framework Agreement, but the Council is entitled to expect that the Agency will operate in accordance with its obligations under the Framework Agreement when considering whether or not to enter into the Framework Agreement. The LGA and local authorities control the Agency via their shareholdings so could intervene if the Agency did not abide by the Framework Agreement.

The prime advantage to the Council is the prospect of lower borrowing costs and the possibility to obtain types of loans that are not available from the PWLB. Cheaper capital finance will reduce pressure on the Council's finances. This advantage more than offsets the low risk that a local authority defaults and the Agency is unable to recover the debts owed to it in order to repay the Council any contributions it is required to make.

The Council is not obligated to borrow via the Agency and even if it chooses to legally commit to borrowing via a bond issue, it will not be required to take a loan that is not cheaper than the PWLB, so the bond will not be issued. Therefore, the financial risk to the Council of the Agency failing to deliver a saving is eliminated.

7. Equality impact assessment (EIA)

The contents of this report do not have any relevant equalities impact and therefore an equalities assessment is not required.

8. Legal Implications

The Section 151 Officer is required by the Local Government Act 1972 and by the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2011 to ensure that the Council's budgeting, financial management, and accounting practices meet the relevant statutory and professional requirements. Members must have regard to and be aware of the wider duties placed on the Council by various statutes governing the conduct of its financial affairs.

9. Director of Finance's comments

All financial considerations are contained within the body of the report and the attached appendices

.....
Signed by Director of Finance and Information Services (Section 151 Officer)

Appendix A: Further Information about the UK Municipal Bonds Agency

Appendix B: Further Information about the Framework Agreement and the Joint and Several Guarantee

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
1 UK Municipal Bonds Agency Plc Documents Package for Local Authorities	Financial Services
2 UK Municipal Bonds Agency Plc Local Authority Financing Framework Agreement	Financial Services

Further Information about the UK Municipal Bonds Agency

Establishment:

The establishment of the UK Municipal Bonds Agency was led by the LGA following the announcement in the 2010 Autumn Statement that PWLB rates would increase from 0.15 per cent over Gilts to 1 per cent over Gilts, greatly increasing the cost of new borrowing and refinancing. This followed the introduction of punitive early repayment penalties by the PWLB in 2007, which have prevented local authorities from restructuring their loan portfolios to reduce costs while interest rates are low. Although the Government subsequently introduced the “certainty rate”, which effectively reduced the PWLB’s margin to 0.8 per cent over Gilts in return for the limited disclosure of an authority’s borrowing plans, the LGA found that rate remained higher than a bonds agency should be able to achieve.

The LGA also noted that it was easy for UK investors such as pension funds to provide capital to overseas local authorities through the London capital markets, but not so to UK local authorities.

The LGA published a revised business case in March 2014 that set out how a bonds agency would issue bonds on behalf of local authorities in an efficient and cost effective manner and at lower rates than the PWLB. It identified that the regulatory environment meant that the PWLB had a de facto monopoly on providing simple loans to local authorities:

- For regulatory purposes a bank must set aside capital when lending to local authorities – unlike when lending to the Government – and therefore it is difficult for banks to compete with the PWLB on rates and make money other than by offering structured lending products.
- Bond investors value liquidity and benchmark sized issues (£250 million), which makes it difficult for most local authorities to access the bond markets, particularly as one-off bond issues can be costly.
- Supranational agencies such as the EIB would typically lend only for large projects, typically £150 million or £250 million depending on the project, thereby excluding most local authorities.

The LGA's revised business case was published in March 2014 and the company established in June 2014. The agency will act as an intermediary, borrowing the money and on-lending it to local authorities on a matched basis to deliver cheaper capital finance to local authorities through periodic bond issues, as an aggregator for loans from other bodies such as the EIB, and facilitating longer term inter-authority lending via the Agency.

The LGA and 56 local government shareholders have invested over £6 million in the Agency. The Council is a shareholder in the Agency with a total investment of £150,000.

Client Base:

The Agency will only lend to UK local authorities who can give a joint and several guarantee. This is currently limited to 353 principal English local authorities that have the general power of competence under section 1(1) of the Localism Act 2011. The Department for Communities and Local Government specifically intended that local authorities should be able to give guarantees using the power in its regulatory impact assessment.

The ability to give joint and several guarantees may in due course be extended to other local authorities e.g. combined, Welsh or Scottish authorities. In the event that this occurs, those authorities will be eligible to borrow from the Agency.

The Agency would prefer all borrowers to become shareholders. This ensures a strong alignment of interest between borrowers and shareholders, and is viewed positively by ratings agencies and the capital markets. Accordingly, the Agency will charge a higher interest rate to borrowers that are not shareholders, albeit one which remains competitive.

Loan Pricing:

The Agency will operate a transparent pricing structure. It will charge local authorities the interest the Agency pays to obtain the funds it on-lends, plus any transaction costs up to a maximum of 0.5 per cent of the amount borrowed, plus a margin to cover its costs. This margin is currently set at:

- 0.10 per cent for shareholders; and
- 0.15 per cent for non-shareholders.

The Agency may adjust these margins for new borrowing transactions at its discretion, but will not increase them. It is expected that these margins will reduce once the Agency is profitable.

Transactions costs include the Agency's credit rating agency fees, bank syndicate fees and legal costs. The Council has the option to amortise these over the life of the loan or to expense them.

The Agency will not require local authorities to borrow at a rate that is higher than the PWLB, thus when borrowing via the Agency the Council should always achieve a saving. Over time, the rates offered by the Agency are likely to improve as its bonds programme develops and it is able to borrow from institutions such as the EIB.

Early Repayment (Prepayment):

The Agency will pass on the cost of early repayment by a local authority (usually referred to as prepayment in financial services) to that local authority. However, the Agency will not profit from the transaction and will assist any local authority seeking early repayment to find the cheapest solution.

Voluntary prepayment is calculated in a similar way to the PWLB's early redemption penalties, although one option available to local authorities will be to buy back part of the bond.

Governance:

The Agency is a public limited company and as such is directed by its Board. It is expected that the Board will include 7 non-executives and 3 executives.

In addition, the Board will have the following 2 sub- committees, chaired by independent non-executives:

- Risk, Compliance and Audit Committee; and
- Nomination and Remuneration Committee.

In addition, the Agency will establish a Local Authority Advisory Board, comprising local authority finance officers, to facilitate two-way communication between the Agency and its borrowers.

Credit Process:

Prior to approving any loans, the Agency will carry out a credit assessment of each potential borrower.

The Agency has developed a proprietary credit scoring model based on similar methodologies to the main credit rating agencies. In order to access funding from the Agency, a local authority will need to be able to achieve a "single A" credit rating on a standalone basis; rating agencies typically "notch up" a local authority to account for implied Government support.

In addition to credit scoring, the MBA will ensure appropriate diversification of its lending portfolio, through the contractual concentration limits agreed in the Framework Agreement.

Further Information about the Framework Agreement and the Joint and Several Guarantee

Content of the Framework Agreement:

The Framework Agreement comprises:

The Framework Agreement itself, which is primarily designed to prevent a call on the joint and several guarantee and lays out how the Agency will interact with local authorities.

Schedule 1: *Form of Authority Accession Deed*, which local authorities sign to commit themselves to the Framework Agreement.

Schedule 2: *Form of Guarantee*, which is the joint and several guarantee.

Schedule 3: *Loan Standard Terms*, which is the loan agreement that covers any borrowing by an authority.

Schedule 4: *Form of Loan Confirmation*, which supplements the Loan Standard Terms and confirms details of a loan such as principal, maturity, interest rate etc. It is signed by the Agency and a borrower.

Need for the Joint and Several Guarantee:

The LGA's business case highlighted the need for borrowing authorities to sign a joint and several guarantee:

- The joint and several guarantee allows the Agency to issue bonds without having to prepare a full prospectus for each bond issue, pursuant EU's "Prospective Directive", thereby reducing costs and complexity.
- The UK Listing Authority's "listing rules" that govern whether financial instruments can be listed on a UK stock exchange would not permit bonds issued by an agency to be listed on the London Stock Exchange for some years without a joint and several guarantee, meaning the bonds would need to be listed elsewhere such as the Channel Islands or Luxembourg.

- If, instead of a joint and several guarantee, investors had recourse to an agency's on-lending arrangements, every tranche of financing would require a separate credit rating and investors to assess the participating authorities, which would materially impact an agency's ability to reduce costs and deter a number of potential investors and lenders from lending money to the agency. The joint and several guarantee draws on the strength of the local government sector and is simple for investors to understand.

Nature of the Joint and Several Guarantee:

The joint and several guarantee is a schedule to the Framework Agreement and is direct, unconditional, irrevocable and not separately administered:

The joint and several guarantee "guarantees to each Beneficiary each and every obligation and liability the Company may now or hereafter have to such Beneficiary (whether solely or jointly with one or more persons and whether as principal or as surety or in some other capacity) in respect of the Guaranteed Liabilities and promises to pay to each Beneficiary from time to time on demand the unpaid balance of every sum (of principal, interest or otherwise) now or hereafter owing, due or payable (following the expiry of any grace period provided for) by the Company to any such Beneficiary in respect of any such Guaranteed Liability; and

agrees as a primary obligation to indemnify each Beneficiary from time to time on demand from and against any loss incurred by such Beneficiary as a result of any such Guaranteed Liability being or becoming void, voidable, unenforceable or ineffective as against the Company for any reason whatsoever, whether or not known to such Beneficiary, the amount of such loss being the amount which such Beneficiary would otherwise have been entitled to recover from the Company."

In practice this means that all borrowers are collectively and individually guaranteeing the lenders to the Agency against a default by a local authority.

The Council can withdraw from the joint and several guarantee by giving notice and repaying its loans to the Agency. However, the irrevocable nature of the guarantee means that the Council will continue to guarantee the Agency's borrowings at the date of withdrawal until those borrowings mature. This prevents moral hazard i.e. a local authority borrowing from the Agency to achieve a cheaper borrowing rate, but walking away from the obligations. Withdrawal does mean that the Council will not be guaranteeing future borrowing by the Agency.

Preventing a Call on the Guarantee:

The Framework Agreement mitigates against a possible call on the joint and several guarantee by minimising the risk of default by a local authority, limiting the possible impact of a default and containing a default before the Agency's ability to make payments is threatened.

The Framework Agreement imposes obligations on the Agency that are designed to reduce the possibility of default by a borrower:

- The Agency must credit assess each borrower and exclude those that do not achieve at least the equivalent of a strong investment grade rating equivalent to an "A" rating from the established credit rating agencies such as Moody's.
- "Concentration limits" ensure that the Agency will maintain a diverse loan book over time that limits the proportion of the Agency's loan book that can be lent to a single or small group of authorities.
- Credit lines are available to the Agency that it must utilise in the event of a local authority missing a payment or defaulting, before it has recourse to other borrowers.

The Framework Agreement establishes a "contributions" mechanism that requires borrowers to lend the Agency funds to cover its obligations in the event of a default by a local authority. The contributions are calculated in proportion to an authority's share of the performing loan book. The loans are interest bearing and will be repaid once the Agency has recovered the sums owed to it by the defaulting authority, which it is required to do by the Framework Agreement. If the Council has no outstanding borrowings via the Agency, it will not be called upon to make contributions under the Framework Agreement.

The payment schedules set out in the Framework Agreement are designed to ensure timely payments by local authorities so that error or late payment by a borrower does not risk a call for contributions or under the guarantee.

The Framework Agreement prevents a borrower from taking action against a defaulting authority so that a single authority cannot jeopardise the structure of the Agency and / or act against the interests of other borrowers.

This page is intentionally left blank



Decision maker:	Cabinet – 8 th July 2016 Council – 12 th July 2016
Subject:	Safer Portsmouth Partnership Plan 2016 Update
Report by:	Director of Regulatory Services & Community Safety
Wards affected:	All
Key decision:	No
Budget & policy framework decision:	Yes

1. Summary

This reports sets out the statutory framework that supports the production of the annual community safety plan produced by the Safer Portsmouth Partnership. The plan was approved by the SPP on the 15th February 2016¹

The statutory nature of the plan means it should be formally endorsed by the City Council along with the appropriate organisational boards including Hampshire Constabulary and Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service.

2. Purpose of report

To outline the priorities for the updated Community Safety Plan 2016/17.

3. Background

3.1 The Safer Portsmouth Partnership is required to produce a partnership strategic assessment, which identifies priorities to be included into the statutory Partnership Plan. In 2013 the SPP developed a 5 year plan, with delivery plans that are refreshed annually, however due to the changing nature of public sector funding, the SPP has significantly revised the plan with a reduced number of priorities.

3.2 The structure of the plan is prescribed to an extent and must contain a review of the previous year's performance as well as specific activity and the role of each partner in supporting delivery.

3.3 This latter detail is developed and monitored by multi-agency delivery groups and published separately.

¹, subject to the inclusion of the findings from the community safety surgery 2016

The Strategic Assessment

- 3.4 Every year the Safer Portsmouth Partnership undertakes a 'Strategic Assessment'². This detailed document uses a range of data from partner agencies, including police recorded crime, and provides a summary of local and national analysis and research to assist in setting and revising its action plan by:
- Checking the partnership's current priorities and identifying any emerging issues
 - Providing a better understanding of local issues and community concerns, and
 - Providing knowledge of what is driving the problems to help identify appropriate responses

Last year's strategic assessment highlighted that for the first time in nearly a decade we have seen recorded crime increase in the city, by 9%; this compared against a national increase of 3%. However this is following significant reductions prior to this.

The full strategic assessment can be viewed on the SPP's website:
www.saferportsmouth.org.uk

The Partnership Plan

- 3.4 The plan is a high-level strategic document that sets out priorities identified in the strategic assessment.
- 3.5 Based on evidence in the strategic assessment the 2016/17 local priorities are:
- **Substance misuse** - drug and alcohol misuse, remains the significant driver of acquisitive (theft, burglary etc.) and violent crime.
 - **Domestic abuse** - remains the single biggest driver for violent crime in the city
 - **Anti-Social behaviour (complex individual cases)** - people who commit crime and anti-social behaviour who have a range of complex needs, including mental health problems, substance misuse, domestic abuse and homelessness - this is a cross cutting priority

National priority - Preventing violent extremism

- 3.6 In addition to these main priorities, the SPP will continue to monitor:
- Preventing adult re-offending
 - Young people at risk
 - Troubled families
- 3.7 Performance is managed by the Safer Portsmouth Partnership at its quarterly meetings

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 That the Cabinet recommends to Council that it endorses the strategic priorities contained in the Safer Portsmouth Partnership Plan 2016 update and aligns the relevant budgets to support activity.

² Yearly 'refresh' and full assessment every 3 years.

5. Reasons for recommendations

- 5.1 The Partnership Plan identifies four main priorities which address the underlying issues of crime and anti-social behaviour. By addressing these issues level of crime and anti-social behaviour should reduce.

6. Options considered and rejected

The partnership is under a statutory duty to produce an annual plan.

7. Duty to involve

- 7.1 The plan must include a community consultation process. A Community Safety Survey was undertaken in early 2016, the findings of which have incorporated into the plan.

8. Implications – financial and outcomes

Endorsing the plan and supporting the delivery of work to address community safety priorities should contribute to preventing crime, anti-social behaviour, drug and alcohol misuse and re-offending.

9. Corporate priorities

This report and the project it refers to contribute to the following corporate priorities:

- Reduce crime and the fear of crime
- Protect and support our most vulnerable residents
- Improve efficiency and encourage involvement

10. Equality impact assessment (EIA)

A preliminary EIA has been completed for this plan. Separate EIAs for agreed activity are undertaken as part of the development of delivery plans referred to above.

11. Legal implications

The report is clear in addressing the relevant issues. The report is compliant in that it is a statutory function to produce a community safety plan. The plan seeks to cover a number of key areas without placing any group that may have particular protected characteristics in a disadvantaged position.

12. Head of finance’s comments

There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations contained within the report. The services being monitored through this plan by the Safer Portsmouth Partnership will need to continue to operate within their approved Cash Limit.

.....
Signed by:
Director of Regulatory Services and Community Safety

Appendices:

SPP Plan

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
1. Safer Portsmouth Partnership Strategic Assessment	Community Safety Service www.saferportsmouth.org.uk

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by the Cabinet

.....
Signed by

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by the City Council on

.....
Signed by

Safer Portsmouth Partnership Plan 2013-18 2016 Update



Contents

	Page
Forward by Councillor Rob New, Chair of the Safer Portsmouth Partnership	
Introduction	
Our local strategic priorities	
• Substance misuse	
• Domestic abuse	
• Anti-social behaviour (complex individual cases	
National Priorities	
• Preventing violent extremism	
Areas to monitor	
• Reducing adult re-offending	
• Troubled families (Positive Family Steps)	
• Young people at risk	
Appendices	
Appendix A - Substance misuse delivery plan	
Appendix B - Domestic abuse delivery plan	
Appendix C - Anti-social behaviour (complex cases) delivery plan	

Foreword – Councillor Rob New, Chair of the Safer Portsmouth Partnership and Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Safety

Portsmouth is a great city to live and work in, as well as great place to visit. As the chair of the Safer Portsmouth Partnership (SPP) I know that we are having a positive impact on issues of crime and substance misuse in the city; our unique community safety survey of 1,200 Portsmouth residents tells us fear and experience of crime has reduced since 2014 and 82% of residents were not victims of crime or anti-social behaviour. This supports police data in showing a downward trend in overall crime and anti-social behaviour.

We are however in challenging times for the public sector, with hard decisions having to be made about where we prioritise our diminishing resources. These challenges make effective partnership working even more important and reducing resources also encourage us to look at more innovative ways to achieve our goals. We can achieve much more by targeting our interventions based on robust data analysis and co-ordinating our efforts rather than working in silos: the partnership is greater than the sum of its parts.

This year's plan recognises these challenges, which is why the Safer Portsmouth Partnership has re-prioritised it's work, focusing on the areas which the partnership can have the most impact.



"The partnership is greater than the sum of its parts"

Cllr Robert New

Chairman, Safer Portsmouth Partnership

Introduction

The **Safer Portsmouth Partnership** is responsible for reducing crime, substance misuse and reoffending in Portsmouth. Police and fire services, local authority, health services, the National Probation Service and the new community rehabilitation company for Hampshire (Purple Futures) have been working together for many years to make the city a safe place to live, work and visit. However, austerity measures over the past few years have presented significant financial pressures and for the first time in nearly a decade we have seen recorded crime increase in the city, by 9%; this compared against a national increase of 3%¹. These pressures include:

- A major restructure of probation services as part of the Transforming Rehabilitation agenda.
- Reduced resources across partner agencies which impact on the way in which services are designed and delivered.

Findings from the **Community Safety Survey 2016** also confirm that whilst reductions have been seen in most types of crime reported comparison in 2014, slight increases were seen in assault, theft from a car and robbery and people with disabilities were significantly more likely to be victims of crime in particular, mugging, hate crime or online harassment/intimidation. These findings demonstrate the importance of consulting residents directly as well as referring to existing data sets to get a more complete picture of crime and anti-social behaviour in Portsmouth².

Members of the Safer Portsmouth Partnership Board include Portsmouth's police commander; Portsmouth City Council's Cabinet Member for Environment & Community Safety, Chief Executive; senior leaders from Hampshire Probation Trust, Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service, and the Chief Operating Officer for the NHS's Clinical Commissioning Group as well as a representative from the voluntary and community sectors and Portsmouth University.

For more information about the Safer Portsmouth Partnership and more detail on crime trends, causes and analysis, visit: www.saferportsmouth.org.uk

¹ Changes to police crime recording following the HMIC data integrity report 'Crime recording: making the victim count' 2015 will have had an impact on these figures.

² The full report Portsmouth Community Safety Survey 2016 will be published on the SPP website in July 2016.

Our local strategic priorities

Every year the Safer Portsmouth Partnership undertakes a 'Strategic Assessment'. This detailed document uses a range of data from partner agencies, including police recorded crime, and provides a summary of local and national analysis and research to assist in setting and revising its action plan by:

- Checking the partnership's current priorities and identifying any emerging issues
- Providing a better understanding of local issues and community concerns, and
- Providing knowledge of what is driving the problems to help identify appropriate responses

The **Strategic Assessment 2015** uses data from the period April 2014-March 2015 and a 'scan' of up to date crime figures and recommends priorities for the SPP's plan. As a result of continuously reducing resources, this year's plan also recommends refocusing the number of strategic priorities down from six to three. Based on evidence in the strategic assessment the 2016/17 priorities are:

- **Substance misuse** - drug and alcohol misuse remains the significant driver of acquisitive³ and violent crime.
- **Domestic abuse** - remains the single biggest driver for violent domestic crime in the city and is the most significant factor in the majority of child protection cases, where children are coming into social care. Portsmouth City Council is currently undergoing a domestic abuse service review and evidence shows that the third sector could play a more important role in direct service provision.
- **Anti-social behaviour (complex individual cases)** - our research tells us that people who have a range of complex needs, including mental health problems, substance misuse, domestic abuse and homelessness can also be involved in crime and anti-social behaviour; this is a cross cutting priority involving many different services and requires co-ordination.

National Priorities

- **Preventing violent extremism**

³ Theft and burglary

SPP will monitor other priority areas

- **Preventing adult re-offending** - the new community rehabilitation companies launched in June 2015 across the UK; it is too early to measure the success of the new arrangements so partnership support for this work has been re-directed to other areas.
- **Young people at risk** - this continues to be a major priority for the city, however it is more appropriately managed by the Children's Trust, which has strategic leadership for young people generally and oversees the majority of financial resources in this area including early intervention and prevention (as part of the development of the multi-agency locality teams) and Portsmouth's Youth Offending Team. The performance and development of **Positive Family Steps** (the 'troubled families' service) will continue to report to the partnership on progress to reduce youth offending, domestic abuse and substance misuse.

Substance misuse

Reducing drug misuse and alcohol related harm have previously been separate priorities. With the reduction in funding available for prevention and treatment services in both areas, the work to reduce harm will be joined up to deliver the required level of savings.

Significant improvements have been seen in substance misuse in the past 10 years as a result of significant investment in drug and alcohol provision. This has delivered increased numbers of people accessing treatment services. In addition the number of young people misusing alcohol and drugs has also reduced.

A changing landscape:

2010

- Total funding for drug (and alcohol)⁴ services in 2010 was: £4.8 million
- An additional £750, 000pa was allocated by Portsmouth City PCT to tackle specific alcohol related harm in 2010.
- Dedicated strategic leads for both drug and alcohol work
- National drive to increase numbers in treatment

⁴ Delivery is integrated

- Significant expansion of treatment capacity on previous years
- Developed the award winning Alcohol Specialist Nurse Service at Queen Alexandra Hospital.

2016

- Services remodelled in 2013, with improved focus on 'recovery' and improved outcomes.
- The Alcohol Interventions Team merged into the new 'Integrated Wellbeing Service', which now delivers alcohol, smoking and health weight provision
- Significant reduction in the capacity of specialist treatment services likely in October 2016 as part of a remodel and retender.
- Public Health moved from the NHS to Portsmouth City Council in 2013, leading to reduction in investment in drug and alcohol services
- Remodelling required again in 2016 to meet further funding reduction.
- Comparable total funding for 2016 will be: £3.2 million
- Increased numbers of street-homeless people with multiple vulnerabilities and associated increased incidences of alcohol and other substance related anti-social behaviour.
- Portsmouth City Council has created a Homelessness Working Group to address the needs (and complex needs) of homeless individuals and how best to help them access the services needed.
- Alcohol related harm continues to be a major burden on public services, including health services, as highlighted by the Nuffield Trust⁵

2020

- Anticipated funding total for 2020 will be below £2,700,000 (a reduction of over 44% since 2010)
- Continued reduction of specialist provision.
- Reduction in strategic capacity to support substance misuse harm reduction, despite increasing levels of harm.

Current performance and evidence

Portsmouth continues to face challenges related to alcohol misuse, but investment in response and treatment services in recent years is beginning to have an impact. This is reflected in the reductions in alcohol related hospital admissions, which this year, for

⁵ <http://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/media-centre/press-releases/stark-challenge-nhs-alcohol-consumption>

the first time, dropped below the national average and the average for our comparator group of areas. However, alcohol specific and alcohol related mortality and chronic liver disease continue at a higher rate than for England, our comparator group and the South East region. To impact on these health indicators requires sustained improvements over ten to twenty years and we are still to reach these milestones since improved investment and prioritisation of alcohol misuse.

We have made good progress towards achieving the plans set out in the 2009-13 Alcohol Strategy. However, despite the progress in reducing alcohol related hospital admissions the burden on public services caused by alcohol misuse is increasing³. There has been a reduction in the capacity of our alcohol treatment services and there has been an associated reduction in the number of people receiving treatment. The percentage of people successfully completing treatment has remained stubbornly low, however action has been taken to remedy this and this area has significantly improved by the second half of the year.

Alcohol screening and brief advice continues to be provided in key settings, including Queen Alexandra Hospital and pharmacies.

Drug use in the city continues to be higher than national averages, particularly for ecstasy and powder cocaine. Whilst this may reflect the urban and age demographic of the city, it continues to be a priority area. There have also been some important changes in the drug profiles for the city with an increase in the use of new psychoactive substances (NPS). For young people this is now the third most reported substance use after alcohol and cannabis⁶. NPS's can be easily accessed regardless of age and are in fact easier for young people to purchase than alcohol and cigarettes. Existing treatment services are more geared to opiate and crack cocaine. So, whilst the figures for NPS use are still relatively small, increased use and the unknown impact on long term health indicators mean it is important to ensure response and treatment services are aware of and responsive to this new challenge. The impact of the new legislation from May 2016, making illegal the sale and purchase of these substances, has yet to be seen but will be monitored.

The new service model began to deliver improved performance, particularly in relation to opiate users successfully completing treatment from the second half of 2014. Particular highlights being the growth of the intensive community rehabilitation service; our consultation work has highlighted the continued growth in the positive impact of peer support and reduced use of in-patient detoxification and residential rehabilitation.

⁶ Portsmouth Drugs Survey 2015

Update on progress of the 2013-18 plan

	Five year aims	Summary of progress
1	A successful outcome-focused, user-led community treatment model established within the city	On target with many milestones achieved, including Portsmouth Users Self Help (PUSH) successfully completing process to become a charitable company.
2	An increased number of people successfully completing drug treatment and achieving sustainable recovery	Partially achieved; ambitions to improve this further need to have a funding stream.
3	Fully implemented family-focused working across the substance misuse treatment and recovery services to improve outcomes for young people affected by familial substance misuse	This has been well embedded into Recovery Hub working practices. The re-modelling of young people's services, including "Roundhouse" has introduced different aspects to this which are being worked through between the hub and young people's public health team.
4	An increased range of peer-led support and interventions, to further increase the visible recovery community in Portsmouth	We have expanded the availability of SMART groups and introduced RAW group for women in recovery ⁷ . Brokers are embedded in all the delivery teams in the pathway, contributing to achieving this aim.
5	An increased number of people accessing 'detox' in an appropriate and effective setting leading to long-term sustained recovery	We have shifted the detox model away from the hospital in-patient only to a more diverse and responsive range of units matched to people's needs; the next step in this process is to increase the use of home/community detox to further reduce costs and hopefully improve outcomes.
6	A reduction in rates of substance misuse related offending, including acquisitive crime and violent crime.	Achievements against this aim have levelled off in the past year following several years of good progress. Evidenced links between substance misuse and crime mean we are likely to see increases in levels of crime and ASB in the coming years.
7	Alcohol related hospital admissions, to at or below the England average by 2018	Portsmouth's rate of admissions is now consistently below the England average. In 20014/15 the Portsmouth rate per 100,000 was 2,035, compared to the England average rate of 2,151 per 100,000

⁷ SMART is Self-Management and Recovery Training, is a recovery support initiative based on motivational interviewing and cognitive behavioral therapy approaches. RAW - Recovery Available for Women - a women only support group. For more information visit: <http://pushrecoverycommunity.org/>

8	An increase in the number of people completing alcohol treatment successfully	We have recently been able to increase the percentage of people successfully completing alcohol treatment successfully; however this is primarily due to recording changes. During 14/15 and 15/16 we have seen a reduction in the number of people engaged in alcohol treatment as capacity has reduced due to funding reductions.
9	A reduction in the percentage of under 18s getting drunk	More young people have never drunk alcohol (40% in 2014), which has been steadily increasing since 2011 (26%). There has been a slight increase in the % of pupils getting drunk (22.6%), however this increase is not statistically significant.

Delivery Plan for 2016-18 (for detailed delivery plan see Appendix A)

Prioritising activity

- Re-model and procure a new service to achieve the required budget savings over the two year period from 2016 - 2018
- Maintain focus on recovery and increasing achievement of positive outcomes despite resource constraints
- Positively reduce numbers of people in long-term substitute prescribing treatment
- Reduce the numbers of drug related deaths
- Increase awareness, knowledge, skills and confidence in broad workforce to support people experiencing problems with New Psychoactive Substances (NPS)
- Improve joined-up/multi-agency working, particularly to engage the most complex/vulnerable/challenging people to meet their treatment and support needs and reduce risks to themselves and others (see also ASB/complex needs page 16)
- Support the new treatment provider(s) to design and develop the services to prioritise activities aligned to achieving these priority outcomes.
- Maintaining some level of alcohol specialist nurse provision at QA hospital.

Early intervention and self help

- Developing capacity amongst non-specialist services to deliver alcohol identification and brief advice (GPs, hospital, social care etc.).
- Continue to work with schools and other children's services to address substance misusing parents and prevent young people from developing substance misuse behaviours.

Domestic abuse

Domestic abuse not only causes emotional harm to victims but has wider consequences for the victim and other family members including loss of opportunity, isolation from friends, poor physical and mental health, and detrimental impact on employment.⁸ Domestic abuse is a commonly quoted reason for homelessness in women.⁹ Many children are exposed to domestic abuse and violence at home and are denied a safe and stable home environment.

Where domestic abuse services offer support to victims throughout the court process, a higher proportion result in a successful court outcome. Domestic abuse is monitored by a specialist domestic abuse review group as it remains the most common driver for violent assaults and is thought to cost Portsmouth services around £13.5 million per year. This includes costs of over £6 million to health services, over £3 million to the criminal justice system (excluding police), over £2 million to the police, over £1 million to children's social care and £600,000 to local authority housing services.¹⁰ There has been a significant amount of activity throughout the year to develop a more coordinated community response to domestic abuse within the city.

A changing landscape:

2010

- Funding for provision of domestic abuse support services included £385,000 for victims plus refuge funding for 21 beds, £30,000 for group work and 121 support for young people.
- Multi-agency training funded by external grants or spot purchased
- As a result of the last commissioning review in 2011/12, funding *increased* by £195,000 (£155,000 from Primary Care Trust and £40,000 from Children Social Care)
- No domestic homicides in Portsmouth for a number of years

⁸ 21% of women who reported domestic abuse in the self-completion module of the 2001 British Crime Survey took time off work because of the abuse and 2% lost their jobs (Walby & Allen, 2004).

⁹ 40% of homeless women stated domestic violence was a contributor to their homelessness (Cramer & Carter, 2002).

¹⁰ Graves, S. (2015) The cost of domestic abuse in Portsmouth - available from csresearchers@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

2016

- Funding for domestic abuse - including the voluntary sector - is predominately provided by the local authority with an alarmingly small contribution from Office of the Police Crime Commissioner and a larger one off grant in 2015/16 from central government for work with perpetrators.
- While the budget for commissioned services for victims of domestic abuse through the local authority and partners totals £775,000, additional income is generated from other sources on an ongoing basis.
- Funding for perpetrators of domestic abuse increased during 2015/16 following a £305,000 grant from the DCLG to a total £370,000; however this increase was for 1 year only.
- While the government have recently announced central funding, (such as the £15 million set aside from the 'Tampon Tax') local authorities have yet to be informed how this will be allocated and have been excluded (for unknown reasons) from national communications. Whereas, some of this money has already been pass-ported to national domestic abuse charities, who have also excluded local authorities - such as Portsmouth - from their plans.
- Improved partnerships to support multi-agency delivery across different agendas and needs
- No domestic homicides in Portsmouth for over 10 years, whilst in Hampshire there have been at least five.

2020

- Given the current financial pressures the future of current non-statutory services is uncertain
- If current early intervention services are lost or not significantly redesigned to ensure both an efficient service and a service that really does benefit end users, rather than a tokenism 'service provision', it's likely that there would be an increased demand on public services and third sector organisations who should be preparing to better provide specialist services.

Current performance and evidence

- There has been an increase (n495) in the number of domestic incidents reported to the police in 2014/15 (total 4745) compared with the previous year. However, because of the way police record incidents/crimes, the data available for analysis is not sufficient to understand the drivers for rises in domestic abuse incidents and it is therefore difficult to draw any firm conclusions about these increases.
- Domestic abuse continues to be the largest category of violence in the city, accounting for over 31% of assaults (n1323).
- 70% of court cases had a successful conviction, a significant improvement on 66% in 2012/13.
- The number of high risk cases taken to the multi-agency risk assessment conference (MARAC) increased further to 648 in 2014/15, up by 30 on the previous year and 189 since 2010/11

- There were 1,625 referrals to specialist services which is a 27% (n337) increase from 2013/14 and 55% (n757) increase since 2012/13. Again, we do not know if this is due to an increase in domestic violence, or an increase in reporting of incidents.
- Where victims received specialist support, 81% experienced a reduction in risk and of the families engaged with Positive Family Steps, 85% experienced improved outcomes.
- 13,184 people viewed the domestic abuse pages on the Safer Portsmouth Partnership website, which is an increase of 26% compared with 2013/14.
- In 70% of cases on the child protection plans, domestic abuse is a significant factor. Keeping a child in care or fostered for 12 months costs the council in the region of £22,000 p.a.

Update on progress of the 2013-18 plan

	Five year aims	Summary of progress
1	Co-ordinated community response where each individual agency understands their unique role in responding to domestic abuse.	88% of agencies who completed the Section 11 audit judged themselves good or better for staff responsibilities and competencies. New contracts include provider's responsibility in supporting victims and having trained staff. Key agencies in the city have signed up to the Public Health pledge to support staff who are victims. High numbers of staff attending specialist training.
2	Residents in the city, particularly young people, understand the difference between a healthy relationship and domestic abuse and come forward to seek support at an early stage.	Whilst there have been over 13,000 visits to the SPP website and over 2,000 contacts with young people however there is a need to have better monitoring and delivery of PSHE provision.
3	Front line staff from key public services are confident to 'ask the question'; they can identify domestic abuse (it is not just violence) and are confident in assessing risk in order to target demand for specialist services.	While feedback from specialist domestic abuse training is consistently positive, most referrals (80%) to MARAC continue to come from the police which would indicate there is much more work to do and that many of the organisations accessing the specialist domestic abuse training are not putting it into practice.
4	Those working with children and families fully understand the impact of domestic violence, substance misuse and mental health on healthy child development and family functioning. They are confident to work with children and	281 professionals have attended domestic abuse training and specialist training has been offered to the children's workforce to support identification and responding to victims. More work is required to develop and effective measure for this aim. With

	families to reduce risk and increase safety and capacity for recovery.	the very low level of referrals from professionals, it's difficult to know how effective this training is, if at all.
5	Specialist services have sufficient capacity to manage an open referral process, including self-referrals, and provide a high quality, nationally accredited and effective service.	There has been a 27% (n337) increase in referrals to specialist agencies and 81% experienced a reduction in risk. Of the families engaged with Positive Family Steps, 85% experienced improved outcomes in relation to domestic abuse

Delivery Plan for 2016-18 (For details see Appendix B)

Prioritising activity

- Due to increasing demands, funding pressures and the current strategy being in place for over 3 years the SPP has commissioned an update of the strategy.
- Funding for victims of domestic abuse will be maintained at their current level for 2016/17 with a new strategic launch in April 2017.
- Continue to develop shared funding proposals that will deliver a 'coordinated community response' to victims of domestic abuse whereby all public agencies, including children's and adult's services, statutory and non-statutory provision contribute in one way or another.
- Raise the profile of domestic abuse and the costs to public services nationally.

Early intervention and self help

- Developing capacity amongst non-specialist services to identify and respond to victims of domestic abuse.
- Continue to work with children's services and Positive Family Steps to develop a coordinated response to victims of domestic abuse including developing services where there is conflict or violence between young people and their parent/carer.
- Continue to encourage self-help by publicising information and advice on the SPP site and awareness raising communications campaigns.

A detailed delivery plan will be published once the current strategic review is complete in late Summer 2016.

Anti-social behaviour (complex individual cases)

Analysis of complex cases of ASB over the past two years has identified a range of associated risk factors (mental health, substance misuse, persistent offending, domestic abuse, child protection, learning disabilities) present in a high proportion of cases, some of which have been on-going for as long as 8 years, taking up huge resources.

These cases are managed largely by the ASB Unit and many involve **individual adults** (as opposed to young people or families); often the distinction between victim and perpetrator is unclear, for example some women 'perpetrators' are also victims of domestic abuse; others who are vulnerable to exploitation by transient drug dealers using their properties may also have complex needs themselves. Hand in hand with these issues are problems with accommodation; employment, training and education, financial management skills and other life skills. Like 'troubled families', these individuals can be involved with a number of different services at any one time or may fall between services, or fail to hit service thresholds and receive no support until critical incidents bring them to the attention of emergency services.

A changing landscape:

2010

- ASB Unit and partners achieved Beacon Area status in 2008 and were being used by other authorities to disseminate best practice in relation to partnership work in 2015.
- Integrated anti-social behaviour unit (ASBU), with local authority housing staff, police officer and solicitor
- Environmental Enforcement Team, issuing fixed penalty notices and monitoring waste and highways
- Preventing Youth Offending Project (early intervention), actively working with many ASB cases involving young people and their families
- Dedicated community warden team patrolling whole city, providing reassurance and early intervention around known risk factors
- Dedicated hate crime team supporting victims of racial, homophobic and disability hate crime
- Safer Neighbourhood Teams integrated in the community and four multi-agency community tasking and co-ordinating groups, problem solving local issues and attended by local councillors.

2016

- Community warden team and the environmental enforcement team refocused on providing a community warden functions as well as a clean city service and responsive patrols, which despite a reduction in staffing numbers, has seen capacity increase and productive outcomes increase across the city.
- Enforcement team, also managed by property services now working with Estate Service Officers (local authority housing).
- The ASB Unit continues with one caseworker in post.
- Preventing Youth Offending Project ended in 2012, with resource moving to the Integrated Targeted Youth Support Service, which has subsequently ceased.
- Hate crime service ended to eliminate duplication of Police support.
- Changes to police structures and priorities being reviewed but no further cuts to police budgets in 2015 spending review. The Hampshire Police and Crime Commissioner had an additional surplus in his budget which could have been used to provide Community Safety services in Portsmouth.

2020

- All non-statutory services provided by the council will all be at risk including the remaining staff in ASB Unit, Early Intervention Project.
- Uncertainty in relation to police and fire priorities pending further internal restructures and reviews
- Reduction of wrap around services e.g. substance misuse and other Public Health cuts

Current performance and evidence

Reported levels of anti-social behaviour (ASB) continued to reduce in Portsmouth, as well as nationally. However, Portsmouth has a higher number of incidents 42.5 per 1000 than the national average of 31 per 1000. This may partly be explained by comparing an urban data set with a national (*urban and rural*) data set or it may reflect more conscientious recording of incidents. Even so, ASB incidents are down nearly 3% (n269) on last year and nearly 14% (n1423) from 2012/13. As a result of recording practices across a number of agencies, including the police, it is difficult to understand what is driving increases or decreases in anti-social behaviour. The SPP has conducted a resident's survey for many years and, as referenced above, has recently undertaken 'dip' sampling from the city's case management database to better understand the issues so that appropriate responses can be delivered.

2016 Community Safety Residents Survey

In 2016, working with Portsmouth University Students, the Safer Portsmouth Partnership Research and Analysis team completed 1,245 face to face interviews with Portsmouth residents; this provides good representative sample of the population. Key findings from the survey included:

Anti-social behaviour

- The quality of life reported by respondents was marginally higher and there was slightly less concern about anti-social behaviour in comparison with the 2014 survey. This corresponds to a 14% (5 percentage point) increase in respondents who have not experienced or witnessed anti-social behaviour.
- Reductions have been seen for most types of anti-social behaviour reported to this survey in comparison with the 2014, but increases have been seen in traffic issues, begging and neighbour disputes.
- The most commonly experienced or witnessed types of anti-social behaviour were: noise in the street, litter, street drinking, domestic noise, dog mess, traffic issues and criminal damage.
- Residents in Charles Dickens ward reported experiencing the most anti-social behaviour, followed by Central Southsea, St Thomas and Fratton.

Overall, the level of people avoiding or being fearful of some areas in Portsmouth has decreased since 2012. The top three areas that people most fear or avoid have remained fairly constant - Somerstown, Buckland, Fratton. The main reason for avoiding areas continues to be due to a bad reputation. However, the **City Centre and Southsea have crept up from not being ranked at all to 4th and 5th position** in the last two surveys.

A copy of the full report on the survey findings is available on www.saferportsmouth.org.uk

Update on progress of the 2013-18 plan

	Five year aims	
1	A reduction of 3% each year in anti-social behaviour reported to the police.	There has been a 3% reduction (n269) to the previous year and 14% Reduction (n1423) from 2012/13. Based only on the police data, this aim has been achieved.
2	Less people believe anti-social behaviour is a problem in their area	Community Safety residents' survey shows slightly less residents believed anti-social behaviours is a problem in their area.
3	Reduced fly tipping and littering	Community Wardens and Environment Enforcement Officers have formed a safe, clean and tidy team to tackle fly tipping and littering. The Community Wardens are now all trained and will issue Fixed Penalty Notices for littering.
4	Reduced complaints about noise	There has been a 10% reduction in noise nuisance cases referred to the Noise Pollution Control Team (n243) although this could be connected with less referrals from the police. More research is required to understand what particular issues are driving noise complaints and whether these issues are linked to risk factors in other areas.
5	Vulnerable and repeat victims are identified early and have appropriate support in place.	Individual agencies continue to work towards this but there is no central recording system currently being used by all partners to capture numbers. This will be prioritised in 2016/17 and linked to the complex needs work.

Delivery Plan for 2016-18 (For delivery plan see Appendix C, p. 27)

Prioritising activity

- The partnership will prioritise the needs of complex individuals.
- Work to improve support for a small cohort of individuals with a 'dual diagnosis' has been on-going for some years. SPP partners have agreed the need to prioritise and support this work in 2016, focusing on individuals with complex needs (not necessarily a diagnosis).
- Partnership support officers will work with an existing multi-agency group (complex needs group) led by the head of community health services to develop this work as part of 'Pledge 9' of Portsmouth's mental health strategy to identify a priority cohort (approx. 20-30 individuals);

- Support the implementation of a virtual process to address current case management issues across different agencies
- Undertake a pathway analysis that will help to identify duplication, gaps and opportunities for efficiency savings and driving down demand.

Early intervention and self help

We will use process re-engineering to improve initial responses to known risk factors and link this to work being led by the police in relation to the re-design of community tasking and co-ordinating groups. With staff reductions in the ASB unit, training staff in other services and linking closely with the new multi-agency teams to spot these risk factors early, and co-ordinate appropriate responses will also be a priority.

A more detailed delivery plan will be published later in the year to include the outcome of the above work.

Preventing violent extremism

The Prevent strategy is one of the four elements of CONTEST, the national counter terrorism strategy, and covers all forms of extremism and has three strategic objectives:

- a. Respond to the ideological challenge of terrorism and the threat we face from those who promote it;
- b. Prevent people from being drawn into terrorism and ensure that they are given appropriate support; and
- c. Work with sectors and institutions where there are risks of radicalisation that we need to address

The Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015 has placed new responsibilities on "specified authorities" in the exercise of their functions to have "due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism".

The Prevent agenda is overseen by the Safer Portsmouth Partnership and Portsmouth City Council has recruited a Prevent Coordinator who has;

- a. Developed and coordinated a risk assessment and action plan for the City with partners and
- b. Set up a Prevent delivery board consisting of representatives from the specified authorities

A channel panel is already established in Portsmouth and is chaired by Adult Social care. The Channel Panel considers individual cases where there is concern of radicalisation and provides appropriate support and interventions.

Priority areas to monitor

Reducing re-offending

The internal focus required to restructure the National Probation Service and the new Community Rehabilitation Company (Purple Futures) over past 12 months has meant performance data has not been available for partners to measure success in reducing reoffending. It is hoped that new IT systems being developed by Purple Futures will provide this data and that the new delivery model (including Integrated Offender Management and Through the Gate services at Winchester Prison) once established will improve outcomes for offenders and the communities in which they live and work.

Troubled families (Positive Family Steps)

The Positive Family Steps service contributes to all three of the new SPP priorities as well as those identified as areas to monitor. The Troubled Families Outcomes Plan sets out what partners consider to be successful outcomes for families against each of the six headline problems (crime and anti-social behaviour; education; children who need help; worklessness/NEET; domestic abuse; and health). On-going development work in 2016/17 includes:

- Streamline the identification of families with multiple problems who are eligible for the Troubled Families Programme through targeted use of the Early Help Profile and via the Multi-Agency Teams allocation process.
- Procure an IT system for recording families eligible for the Troubled Families Programme (and other families with multiple problems), tracking their progress and making PBR claims (where appropriate). If possible, procure a single system that can support the Troubled Families Programme, Multi-Agency Teams and the Early Help Profile.
- Continue to expand provision of intensive family support to families with multiple problems (Tier 3).
- Embed Single Assessment Framework - lead professional-led whole family working to support families with multiple problems to make significant and sustained change.

Young people at risk

Changing landscape

In 2010 the YOT was part of the broader pan Hampshire Wessex YOT. As a consequence there is no comparable data, however overall resources would have been more extensive than now. Currently the YOT is seeking to identify savings for 2016 onwards,

though budgets have yet to be set. A proposed service delivery model is going to the YOT Board in early 2016 which reconfigures the YOT to integrate with the proposed Multi-Agency Teams (MATs). The risks to service delivery in lieu of this are obvious. Currently the Ministry of Justice is reviewing Youth Justice with results due for publication in the summer. This will dictate anticipated resourcing in 2020, which is anticipated to be significantly different from now

Reducing the number of first time entrants to the criminal justice system is a major priority for the city and this will now be overseen by the Children's Trust which has strategic leadership for young people and resources in this area. The following section includes a review of the work since 2013 to date, but to avoid duplication, will not include a delivery plan for future years.

Current performance

Good progress has been made towards achieving strategic plans. The target reduction of young offenders was met and the reduction in offences is on target. There has been a change in the way we measure the number of young offenders causing five or more offences so we are unable to provide up to date data at this time. The Youth Offending Team (YOT) Board are overseeing the work to address these data issues. The YOT was inspected by HMIP in 2015 and the report published was overwhelmingly positive. An improvement plan was drafted, which forms part of the Youth Justice Strategic Plan approved by the SPP and was considered alongside improving poor outcomes for young people with multiple problems.

Update on progress of the 2013-18 plan

	Five year aims	Summary of progress
1	To significantly reduce the number of young people committing 5 or more offences	By the end of the year only 18 young people had committed 5+ or more offences over a rolling 12 month period
2	To continue to reduce the number of first time entrants (FTE) into the criminal justice system	First Time Entrants Data fluctuated and there were queries about integrity of YJB data. Nonetheless, there had been a 4% reduction in three years according to data published by the YJB in September (103 FTE for 12/13, 111 for 13/14 and 99 for 14/15)
3	To support other city priorities to reduce poor outcomes for young people	Roll out of Multi-Agency Teams (MATs) to support early intervention and reduce likelihood of poor outcomes, including offending, is being developed.
4	To Continue to reduce the number of young people entering custody	By the end of 2014/15, the rate of young people entering custody was below the National Average- though not below the regional average

Delivery plans

Appendix A - Substance Misuse

Main indicator	Lead Officer	Target 16/17
Number of people accessing treatment for drug dependency- Target 2014/5 was 852	Barry Dickinson	852
Proportion of people successfully completing drug treatment	Barry Dickinson	Top Quartile for MSG
Full recording of parental status for people accessing substance misuse treatment - Target 2014/5 was 100% compliance	Barry Dickinson	100% compliance
Number of recovery brokers providing peer support. Target 2014/5 was 25 fully trained - 40 to attend PUSH forum	Barry Dickinson	15 complete training; 15 working in Hub
Proportion of people successfully completing 'detox and not representing in 6 months	Barry Dickinson	Top Quartile MSG
Reduction of violent crime rate- serious acquisitive crime and overall acquisitive crime - Target 14/15 was 5% reduction on 2013/14 figures	Alan Knobel	5% reduction
Increase successful completions as a proportion of all in treatment - opiates & non opiates	Barry Dickinson	Top Quartile:
Increase successful completions as a proportion of all in treatment - non	Barry Dickinson	Top Quartile
Reduce number of representations :Non opiates& Opiates (proportion who successfully completed treatment in the first 6 months of the latest 12 months period) Target 14/15 top quartile range	Barry Dickinson	Top Quartile
Reduce alcohol related hospital admissions to the England average by 2017/18.	Alan Knobel	England average rate
To treat at least 15% of our dependent drinker population annually	Alan Knobel	THIS INDICATOR HAS BEEN ABANDONED AS IT IS NO LONGER POSSIBLE TO ACHIEVE
To screen 15000 people annually for their alcohol use in GP's surgeries, pharmacies A&E etc.	Alan Knobel	15000 screened annually
Proportion of people successfully completing alcohol treatment	Alan Knobel	To achieve England average
Reduce the percentage of young people getting drunk in the past four weeks from 21% in 2012 to 18% in 2017/8	Alan Knobel	18%
Reduce number of representations into alcohol treatment to the	Alan Knobel	England average

England average		
Increase percentage of off licenses participating in the Reducing the Strength scheme	Rob Anderson-Weaver	
Priority activity 2016/17	Lead Officer and organisation	By when
Re-modelling and procurement of drug and alcohol treatment service	Barry Dickinson ICS	November 2016
Implementation of national and local actions regarding NPS	Alan Knobel PCC	June 2016
Implement effective working protocols to better support drug and alcohol users with multiple/complex/challenging needs	Barry Dickinson	March 2017
Implement improved and more integrated supported housing for drug and alcohol users	Barry Dickinson	March 2017
Work with university partners, including the University of Portsmouth and the University of Southampton to bid for funding and undertake research in innovation in Portsmouth	Alan Knobel / Barry Dickinson	March 2018
Support the Integrated Wellbeing service to deliver effective alcohol interventions	Alan Knobel	March 2017
Work with partners, such as the Fire service and Adult Social Care, to expand the amount and range of settings alcohol identification and brief advice is delivered in.	Alan Knobel	March 2018
Deliver the Community Alcohol Partnership in Milton and Fratton areas and seek to expand to other parts of the city.	Karen Monteith, Public Health; Tracey Greaves, Trading Standards	March 2017
Continue to promote the Reducing the Strength scheme, encouraging retailers to stop selling super strength cider and beer.	Rob Anderson-Weaver	March 2018
Take a pro-active stance in making appropriate licensing representations.	Police & PCC	March 2018
Seek to maintain the cumulative impact area in the city centre for on licensed premises. Where appropriate seek new cumulative impact areas for off licensed premises if alcohol harm can be suitably evidenced.	Alan Knobel	March 2017
Seek to develop a 'Wellbeing Centre' at Queen Alexandra Hospital	Wellbeing Service Manager	July 2016

Appendix B - Domestic Abuse

Main indicator	Lead Officer	Target 16/17
TBC Increase referrals to MARAC from agencies other than the police	Bruce Marr	60% to 75% of referrals to be from the police
Secondary indicators		
Residents in the city, particularly young people, understand the difference between a healthy relationship and domestic abuse and come forward to seek support at an early stage	Bruce Marr	1000 children and young people aged 6 to 18 receive health relationship training
		8000 visits to the SPP website
Those working with children and families fully understand the impact of domestic violence, substance misuse and mental health on healthy child development and family functioning. They are confident to work with children and families to reduce risk and increase safety and capacity for recovery	Bruce Marr	120 professionals to be trained
Specialist services have sufficient capacity to manage an open referral process, including self-referrals, and provide a high quality, nationally accredited and effective service	Bruce Marr	Reduce risk of victims accessing support in 75% of cases
		Referrals to specialist domestic abuse provision to be maintained between 1200 and 1400 referrals
		Reduce risk for those accessing Up2U: Target to be set when strategic review is complete
Priority activity 2016/17	Lead Officer and organisation	By when
To complete DA strategic review	Bruce Marr	Summer 2016
Review refuge contract	Bruce Marr	March 2017
Deliver a coordinated community response to victims of domestic abuse through embedding systems within governance arrangements, multi-agency training and working in partnership.	Bruce Marr	March 2017
Identify and streamline funding	Bruce Marr	March 2017

Appendix C- Anti-social behaviour (complex cases)

Main indicator	Lead Officer	Target 16/17
To be identified during 2016/17	Lisa Wills	
Secondary indicators		
To be identified during 2016/17		
Priority activity 2016/17	Lead Officer and organisation	By when
Co-ordinate activity to develop a multi-agency response to complex cases	Lisa Wills Barry Dickinson	March 2017
Co-ordinate commissioning between Portsmouth City Council and Portsmouth Clinical Commissioning Group to improve integration substance misuse, rough sleeping and homeless healthcare services.	Barry Dickinson	March 2017
Work with the Complex Needs Group and other partners to undertake a pathway analysis, using a Systems Thinking approach.	Barry Dickinson and Lisa Wills	March 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Equality Impact Assessment

Preliminary assessment form v5 / 2013

www.portsmouth.gov.uk

The preliminary impact assessment is a quick and easy screening process. It should:

- identify those policies, projects, services, functions or strategies which require a full EIA by looking at:
 - negative, positive or no impact on any of the equality groups
 - opportunity to promote equality for the equality groups
 - data / feedback
- prioritise if and when a full EIA should be completed
- justify reasons for why a full EIA is not going to be completed

Directorate:

Director of Regulatory Services and Community Safety

**Function e.g. HR,
IS, carers:**

Strategy & Partnership

Title of policy, service, function, project or strategy (new or old) :

Safer Portsmouth Partnership Plan 2016 update

Type of policy, service, function, project or strategy:

- Existing
- New / proposed
- Changed

Q1 - What is the aim of your policy, service, function, project or strategy?

To reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and substance misuse in Portsmouth.

Q2 - Who is this policy, service, function, project or strategy going to benefit or have a detrimental effect on and how?

Benefit all residents with reduced crime and anti-social behaviour. Benefit people with risk factors linked to offending and substance misuse.

Q3 - Thinking about each group below, does, or could the policy, service, function, project or strategy have a negative impact on members of the equality groups below?

Group	Negative	Positive / no impact	Unclear
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transgender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pregnancy and maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other excluded groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If the answer is "negative" or "unclear" consider doing a full EIA

Q4 - Does, or could the policy, service, function, project or strategy help to promote equality for members of the equality groups?

Group	Yes	No	Unclear
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Race	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transgender	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sexual orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Religion or belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pregnancy or maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other excluded groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If the answer is "no" or "unclear" consider doing a full EIA

Q5 - Do you have any feedback data from the equality groups that influences, affects or shapes this policy, service, function, project or strategy?

Group	Yes	No	Unclear
Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Race	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transgender	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sexual orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Religion or belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Pregnancy and maternity

Other excluded groups

If the answer is "no" or "unclear" consider doing a full EIA

Q6 - Using the assessments in questions 3, 4 and 5 should a full assessment be carried out on this policy, service, function or strategy?

yes

No

Q7 - How have you come to this decision?

This plan is a statutory requirement. The plan is strategic in nature, however does include a number of policy plans, commissioning reviews etc. which will all be the subject an EIA.

If you have to complete a full EIA please contact the Equalities and diversity team if you require help
Tel: 023 9283 4789 or email:equalities@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

Q8 - Who was involved in the EIA?

Alan Knobel - Substance misuse co-ordinator
Lisa Wills - Strategy & Partnership manager

This EIA has been approved by: Rachael Dalby

Contact number:

4040

Date:

17th June 2016

Please email a copy of your completed EIA to the Equality and diversity team. We will contact you with any comments or queries about your preliminary EIA.

Telephone: 023 9283 4789

Email: equalities@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

Agenda Item 11

Notice of Motion Referral from the Council Meeting held on 9 February 2016

(a) Cancelled Meetings

Proposed by Councillor Matthew Winnington
Seconded by Councillor Ben Dowling

This Council regrets the cancellation of Full Council, Cabinet, Health and Social Care & Culture and Leisure decision making meetings in January. The meetings were all cancelled for 'lack of urgent business' but with local people having immediate important issues they want addressing at Full Council, Cabinet, Health and Social Care & Culture and Leisure meetings it has given the impression that the cancellation of the meetings is a way of ignoring their concerns and stopping them having a say.

This council urges Governance and Audit and Standards Committee to consider an amendment to Standing Orders to require the administration to ensure that all parties on the council are consulted in future before cancellation of any further decision making meetings (following best practice from the likes of the Housing cabinet member and others) and that when 'urgent business' is considered that petitions and other pressing questions and issues from local residents are included in that definition.

This page is intentionally left blank



Title of meeting:	Governance and Audit and Standards Committee
Date of meeting:	1 July 2016
Subject:	Consideration of the appointment of an additional Independent Person
Report by:	City Solicitor
Wards affected:	All
Key decision:	No
Full Council decision:	Yes

1. Purpose of report

To consider the issues and procedure for the appointment of an additional Independent Person, pursuant to the provisions of Section 28 of the Localism Act 2011.

2. Recommendations

(1) That Governance & Audit & Standards Committee recommend that Council

- (i) re-appoints the existing Independent Persons for one year until May 2017**
- (ii) Agrees to increase the number of Independent Persons who can be appointed from 3 to 4**

(2) That Governance & Audit & Standards Committee agree that

- (i) Portsmouth City Council advertise for suitable applicants to fill the role/s of an Independent Person/s**
- (ii) An interviewing panel comprising three cross party group members of Governance and Audit and Standards Committee refer the appointments of the successful candidates to Council for approval (through the Committee)**
- (iii) Consideration is given to pay an allowance to each Independent Person in a sum agreed**

3. Background

- 3.1. Following consideration by Governance and Audit and Standards Committee and Council in March 2013, the Council agreed to the appointment of three Independent Persons for a period of 3 years. Following advertisement and

interview, two Independent Persons were appointed. The third position has remained vacant as no suitable candidate was found at that time.

- 3.2. The term of office of the present Independent Persons came to an end in May 2016. It is proposed that their term is renewed for a further year and in the interim an additional two Independent Persons are sought. This will allow for a pool of four Independent Persons which appears to be appropriate, taking into account the number of complaints which have had to be dealt with since their appointment.

4. Reasons for recommendations

It is hoped that the appointment of additional Independent Persons will help to expedite the establishment of Initial Filtering Panels which have had, in the past, to be delayed, due to the unavailability of Independent Persons and Members.

5. Role of the Independent Person

- 5.1. The Council is required to appoint at least one Independent Person. These are persons who must have no connection with the Council
- 5.2. They do not have decision making powers and their role is purely to advise.
- 5.3. Their functions are:-
 - 5.3.1. To be consulted by the Council before it makes a finding as to whether a member has failed to comply with the Code of Conduct or decides what action is to be taken in respect of that Member;
 - 5.3.2. They may be consulted by the Council in respect of a Code of Conduct complaint at any other stage; and
 - 5.3.3. They may be consulted by a Member or co-opted Member of the Authority against whom a complaint has been made.

6. Procedure for appointment

It is proposed that the following procedure is followed for the appointment of the independent Persons:

- 6.1. The role is advertised on the Council's website.
- 6.2. An advertisement is placed in a local newspaper.
- 6.3. Applications to be considered by the Chair and Vice Chair of Governance and Audit and Standards Committee who are to produce a shortlist for interview.
- 6.4. An interview panel is drawn up from a cross party group of three councillors drawn from the Governance and Audit and Standards Committee.
- 6.5. The appointment of the successful candidates to be referred to Council for approval.

7. Remuneration

Although the Localism Act 2011 does provide that the roles may be remunerated, at present the Council does not pay any allowance for the Independent Persons. Members may wish to consider whether it is appropriate to remunerate this role and if they were to do so, this would encourage a wider field of candidates to apply. At present, expenses may be claimed by the Independent Persons and it is proposed that this provision continues.

8. Equality impact assessment

This report does not require an Equality Impact Assessment as it does not propose any new or changed services, policies or strategies.

9. Legal implications

The legal implications are embodied within this report.

10. Director of Finance's comments

There is no current budget provision for the payment of allowances to Independent Persons. Any allowance would need to come from the existing Members' expenses budget.

.....
 Signed by:

Appendices: Nil

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location

This page is intentionally left blank



Title of meeting:	Governance and Audit and Standards Committee
Date of meeting:	1 July 2016
Subject:	Proposed amendments to the Arrangements for the Assessment, Consideration and Investigation of Complaints against Councillors
Report by:	City Solicitor
Wards affected:	N/A
Key decision:	No
Full Council decision:	Yes

1. Purpose of report

To allow members to consider proposed arrangements for the consideration and investigation of complaints against members.

2. Recommendations

The Committee is asked to consider and recommend to Council the following amendments to the process:

- 2.1. Agree that all members of Council may be asked to sit on Sub-Committees of Governance Audit and Standards Committee and the Initial Filtering Panel when they are considering complaints that members have breached the Code of Conduct.
- 2.2. Approve the amended Arrangements for Assessment, Investigation and Determination of Complaints attached at Appendix 1 to this report.
- 2.3. Approve the amended Complaint Form attached at Appendix 2 to this report.

3. Background

The 'new' Arrangements for Assessment, Investigation and Determination of Complaints which were brought in following the Localism Act of 2011 have now been in place for four years and as a result of the practical application of the Council's adopted procedures, it is now thought it would be helpful to make some practical amendments to those procedures. The proposed amendments, it is hoped, will make the procedure more transparent to members of the public and also help with the more efficient management of the process.

4. Reasons for recommendations

- 4.1. Under the present arrangements, only members of Governance Audit and Standards and their deputies may form the Sub-Committees or Initial Filtering Panel required by the process. This limits the pool of potential members to 13. This can provide difficulties in arranging meetings without undue delay. There are also occasions when members have to exclude themselves from the Sub-Committees due to conflict of interest. It is therefore proposed that the potential panel is widened to include all members of Council. A similar process is at present used by the Employment Committee for senior management appeals.
- 4.2. Members will note at Appendix 2 alterations are proposed to the Complaint Form and also the Arrangements for Assessment, Investigation and Determination of Complaints at Appendix 1. None of the proposed changes to either of these documents is substantive but it is hoped will give greater clarity to the procedure which is followed. The proposed alterations arise from a number of discussions and correspondence which we have had with residents who have upon occasions found the process somewhat lacking in clarity.

5. Equality impact assessment

This report does not require an Equality Impact Assessment as it does not propose any new or changed services, policies or strategies.

6. Legal implications

The legal implications are embodied within this report.

7. Director of Finance's comments

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations contained within this report.

.....
Signed by:

Appendices:

Appendix 1 - Arrangements for Assessment, Investigation and Determination of Complaints

Appendix 2 - Complaint Form

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location

This page is intentionally left blank

**COMPLAINT FORM -
Councillors' Code of Conduct**



This form is required to be used to make an allegation that a Councillor of Portsmouth City Council has failed to comply with the Councillors' Code of Conduct. It should not be used if the concern is in respect of dissatisfaction with a Council decision.

1. Your details

Please provide us with your name and contact details

Title:	
First name:	
Last name:	
Address:	
Daytime telephone:	
Evening telephone:	
Mobile telephone:	
Email address:	

Your address and contact details will not usually be released unless necessary to deal with your complaint.

If you do not wish details of your name to be released, please complete section 5 of this form.

2. The complaint process

Once you have submitted your complaint, it is considered by the Monitoring Officer who will decide on the next steps. The Monitoring Officer will meet with the Initial Filtering Panel ("the IFP") to enable the Monitoring Officer to consider and determine the complaint as soon as reasonably practicable after the complaint has been received

When reaching his decision the Monitoring Officers meets with the IFP and also a person unconnected with the Council, known as the Independent Person. The IFP shall comprise three Councillors and it shall insofar as practicable have no more than one Councillor from each political group represented on the Council. This may not always be possible due to the availability of Councillors or because some of them have conflicts of interest which preclude them from being involved in the complaint process. Any Councillor of the Council may be requested to sit on an IFP.

On the basis of your written submission the IFP will assess whether your allegation, if it was investigated, is likely to amount to a breach of the Councillors' Code of Conduct.

The Monitoring Officer may then:-

1. Refer the complaint for investigation
2. Decide that what has been alleged does not come within the requirements of the Code of Conduct and even if investigated could not amount to a breach of the Code of Conduct. (See Local Assessment Criteria <https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/cou-complaints-assessment-criteria.pdf>)
3. Decide on alternative action being taken e.g. mediation or an apology being given.
4. Defer his decision and request further information or clarification from the complainant in respect of the complaint.

If it is decided that your complaint is not to be investigated you may, within 30 days of notification of the decision, ask for that decision to be reviewed. This review will be undertaken by a Governance and Audit and Standards Review Sub-Committee ("the Review Sub-Committee) which consists of three different Councillors from those who originally considered your complaint. The Review Sub-Committee will have the same range of options available to it as the Monitoring Officer.

If it is decided to investigate your complaint, the Monitoring Officer or someone appointed by him will be instructed to undertake the investigation. You will be given further information at that time should an investigation be necessary.

3. Please provide us with the name of the Councillor(s) you believe have breached the Code of Conduct:

Title	First Name	Last Name

4. Please explain in this section (or on separate sheets) what the Councillor has done that you believe breached the Code of Conduct.

(You should give sufficient information to show that what was alleged could amount to a breach of the Code of Conduct).

If you are complaining about more than one Councillor you should clearly explain what each individual Councillor has done that you believe breached the Code of Conduct.

A copy of the Councillors Code of Conduct can be found here:

<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/the-council/councillors-and-mps/complaining-about-a-councillor.aspx>

- You should be specific, wherever possible, about exactly what you are alleging the Councillor said or did. For instance, instead of writing that the Councillor insulted you, you should state what it was they said.
- You should provide the dates of the alleged incidents wherever possible. If you cannot provide exact dates it is important to give a general timeframe.
- You should confirm whether there are any witnesses to the alleged conduct and provide their names and contact details if possible.
- You should provide any relevant background information.

Please provide us with the details of your complaint and the desired outcome from this complaints process. Continue on a separate sheet if there is not enough space on this form.

Signature.....
Date.....

5. Only complete this next section if you are requesting that your identity is kept confidential.

In the interests of fairness and natural justice, we believe Councillors who are complained about have a right to know who has made the complaint. We also believe they have a right to be provided with a copy of the complaint. We are unlikely to withhold your identity or details of your complaint unless you have good reason to justify that we do so.

Please note that requests for confidentiality will not automatically be granted. The Monitoring Officer will consider the request alongside the substance of your complaint. He will then contact you with his decision. If your request for confidentiality is not granted, we will usually allow you the option of withdrawing your complaint.

However, it is important to understand that in certain exceptional circumstances where the matter complained about is very serious, we can proceed with an investigation or other action and disclose your name even if you have expressly asked us not to.

Please provide us with details of why you believe we should withhold your name and/or the details of your complaint:
--

6. Additional Help

Complaints must be submitted in writing on this form. It will assist the processing of your complaint if this is submitted electronically. However, in line with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 2000 we can make reasonable

adjustments to assist you if you have a disability that prevents you from making your complaint in writing.

We can also help if English is not your first language.

If you need any support in completing this form, please let us know as soon as possible.

This complaint should be submitted to the Monitoring Officer by email to:
michael.lawther@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 14

THIS ITEM IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY

(Please note that "Information Only" reports do not require Equality Impact Assessments, Legal or Finance Comments as no decision is being taken)



Portsmouth
CITY COUNCIL

Title of meeting:	Scrutiny Management Panel Full Council Meeting
Subject:	Update report on Scrutiny
Date of meeting:	8 July 2016 12 July 2016
Report by:	Director of Community and Communication
Wards affected:	N/a
Full Council	Yes

1. Purpose

The City Council's Constitution requires information reports to be provided to the Scrutiny Management Panel and subsequently full Council on the work undertaken by the scrutiny panels.

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that

- (1) the report be noted and the work done by the panels be acknowledged.
- (2) Thanks be formally recorded to all those members of the public, witnesses and officers who contributed to the reviews.

3. Information Requested

Work undertaken by each panel

Economic Development, Culture & Leisure Scrutiny Panel (EDCL Panel)

a) Retail Review

During the 2014/15 municipal year the panel, chaired by Councillor Julie Swan, undertook a review "Revitalising Local High Streets and Secondary Shopping Areas in the City" which was completed in March 2015 and submitted to Cabinet on 11 June 2015, where the recommendations were endorsed. The report's recommendations focused on the importance of existing and encouraging new traders' associations and the need for these to meet to share best practice. Further, that the associations should also liaise with the appropriate officers to take forward improvements to the retail areas and attract the necessary funding. During the review the Events Application form was reviewed and simplified which was welcomed by the traders.

**THIS ITEM IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY
(Please note that "Information Only" reports do not
require Equality Impact Assessments, Legal or
Finance Comments as no decision is being taken)**



One of the ideas arising from the review was for use of vacant units in the local shopping areas for cultural projects at Allaway Avenue in Paulsgrove, dependent upon Heritage Lottery Funding being confirmed.¹

b) Student Opportunities

For the 2015/16 municipal year the panel, chaired by Councillor Jennie Brent, looked at *'How to develop wider opportunities - especially to consider involving students from the University and those in other further education to the mutual benefit of the students and the City Council'*

The panel decided that this topic lent itself to a different type of review from the usual evidence gathering over several meetings. Instead, the panel decided to invite all witnesses to attend a one-off evening event on 24 November 2015 (or provide written submissions to be represented). This allowed the panel members to be involved in the discussions and feed-back the views of those attending. This format was also a good networking session for taking forward volunteering opportunities by those involved in this field. It was also a useful forum to highlight the positive contribution of students to community life with the main contributors being representatives from the University's Directorate and Students' Union, from Pompey in the Community and local colleges whose students are encouraged to participate in work experience/placements and aspiration raising events as well as voluntary events (both one-offs and continued projects) in Portsmouth. The City Council's own involvement in the Portsmouth Together project to co-ordinate volunteering experiences was also highlighted and the need for co-ordination of activities.

The panel looked at examples of good practice across Portsmouth from institutions that engage with volunteers and utilise their resource across the city-wide community. The panel sought to identify how pupils in schools and students at College and University are engaged and encouraged to maximise their opportunities and areas of mutual benefit within the locality. This included work placements through the City Council and volunteering placements with various departments as well as apprenticeships with local firms.

The way in which this review was carried out drew support from all political groups represented and cross-party team working was much in evidence throughout the review process.

The report was signed off on 23 March 2016 and went to Cabinet on 9 June 2016 where the panel's recommendations were approved in line with the responses noted in section 4 of the response report.

Housing and Social Care Scrutiny Panel (HSC Scrutiny Panel)

Hospital Discharge Arrangements in Portsmouth

The Housing and Social Care Scrutiny Panel signed off its report, following six evidence gathering meetings hearing from service providers at the City Council including hospital

¹ An information report went to the Cabinet Member for Culture, Leisure & Sport on 18 March 2016

**THIS ITEM IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY
(Please note that "Information Only" reports do not
require Equality Impact Assessments, Legal or
Finance Comments as no decision is being taken)**



Portsmouth
CITY COUNCIL

and health service, housing, occupational therapists and adult social care, Clinical Services at Queen Alexandra Hospital, Age UK Portsmouth, the Integrated Commissioning Unit and Hampshire Domiciliary Care Providers. The Cabinet on 5 March 2015 supported the following recommendations: to continue to improve communication between professionals, to require care agencies to provide feedback to the discharge planning team, to encourage further evening and weekend discharges and continued involvement with patients and their families in the discharge process, and to improve relationships between ASC and PHT.

Cabinet did not support recommendation 1b regarding giving next of kin status to officers as the then Head of Adult Services advised that this was incompatible with their professional status.

Support services for people aged 16-25 living in isolation

The panel received evidence from the Young Persons Support Team, All Saints Hostel, the Portsmouth Foyer, social work students, City Council housing officers, Motiv8, the Teenage Pregnancy Team, Young Parents Support Team and the Positive Family Future Transformation Team. During the review it became apparent that from the evidence gathered the following were experiencing induced feelings of isolation; young parents, young people thrown out of the family home or left by the family, young carers and young people leaving foster care. The report was signed off by the panel on 24 March 2016. It is expected that the report and the response to it will be presented to Cabinet in September.

Education, Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel

A Review into Pupil Premium in Portsmouth Schools

The panel carried out a review into pupil premium in Portsmouth schools which was signed off in February 2015. The aim of the review was to investigate how schools are using and reporting pupil premium monies and whether the Council could identify and disseminate good practice. It was also intended to use the process to ensure that all schools are sharing information about pupil premium appropriately. The panel received evidence from education officers, governors and head teachers to understand the different ways pupil premium grant (PPG) is being used, the impact it is having on schools, the role of the LA in supporting schools with pupil premium and the level of awareness of governors on the use of the pupil premium grant in their schools. A short questionnaire was also sent to all chairs of governors to ascertain further information about the level of involvement of governing bodies. After analysing the responses from the questionnaire it was found that while many governing bodies review PPG at their Finance Committee, the impact of PPG is not being reviewed as much as it could be. The majority of governing bodies said that PPG was well understood by all governors in their schools. However the responses also suggested that further training specifically on PPG would be welcomed to ensure that governors understand fully how to measure the impact.

The Panel noted that overall standards in Portsmouth have risen since PPG has been introduced and PPG eligible children are catching up with the non PPG children. However, as highlighted in the Ofsted Annual Report 2014, more needs to be done in the city. The panel noted some excellent initiatives that are in place for improving education outcomes for pupils and understood that different interventions worked for

**THIS ITEM IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY
(Please note that "Information Only" reports do not
require Equality Impact Assessments, Legal or
Finance Comments as no decision is being taken)**



Portsmouth
CITY COUNCIL

different schools and there is no 'one size fits all' with regard to pupil premium programmes.

A number of recommendations were made by the panel all of which were supported when the report was considered by Cabinet at its meeting in March 2015.

Review of Progress against the Youth Offending Team Action Plan

The panel carried out a review into the Youth Offending Team Action Plan, which was drawn up following an Ofsted inspection in November 2013 which had identified particular weaknesses in Portsmouth, together with higher than average rates of reoffending. The review was completed in June 2015.

The panel received evidence from both internal and external witnesses. It noted that good progress is being made with reducing re-offending rates and reducing custody rates with figures continuing to decrease, although the figures for first time entrants had increased slightly as compared with 12 months ago. The panel welcomed the progress made to date on implementing the actions on the YOT improvement plan and particularly welcomed the co-location of CAMHS and substance misuse workers within the YOT Team.

Recommendations were made by the panel and the report went to Cabinet in September 2015 where the recommendations were supported.

A Review into Home to School Transport and Access to Primary School Places

The panel completed this review in February 2016. The aim of the review was to look at developing proposals around home to school transport especially where children have been unsuccessful in being allocated a place at their first choice school and to consider the more general issues relating to access to primary school places and the distance away from their home. The panel received evidence from officers in the admissions team, pupil place planning team and school transport team to understand the current arrangements for allocating home to school transport and primary school places, and learned what the council is doing to meet the demand for primary school places.

The panel noted that since the introduction of the home to school transport policy in 2014 there has been a decline in non-statutory travel assistance and there has been a reduction in the overspend on the transport budget for 2014/15. It also noted that the council's sufficiency programme has created additional primary school places to meet the current demand and there are contingency plans in place for some schools to run a 'bulge year' if necessary. The panel felt that the issue of primary school places has largely been addressed and is being monitored and the main focus should now be on ensuring there are enough secondary school places.

The report and response report were considered at the Cabinet meeting on 9 June where the recommendations in the scrutiny panel's report were supported subject to the following: in relation to the panel's recommendation (4) concerning moving the sibling criteria above catchment area for primary schools, the outcome of government consultation will be awaited before anything is done in this regard. Also in relation to

**THIS ITEM IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY
(Please note that "Information Only" reports do not
require Equality Impact Assessments, Legal or
Finance Comments as no decision is being taken)**



Portsmouth
CITY COUNCIL

recommendation (5), the council will be undertaking an options analysis during 2016/17 before considering a city-wide consultation.

Traffic, Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Panel

Review of road safety around schools

The aim of the review was to assess the role of education in improving the safety of pupils, the role of enforcement of the current traffic regulations and to evaluate the effectiveness of the road safety measures that are currently in place outside schools. This review was concluded in March 2015.

The panel concluded that everyone has a role to play to ensure the safety of our children by complying with the parking regulations and teaching children road safety.

Cabinet accepted the panel's recommendations in line with the responses noted in paragraph 4 of the response report by the Director of Transport, Environment, and Business Support.

Review into how community safety partners can work together to reduce demand and cost for intensive specialist services currently supporting individuals with complex needs.

At its meeting on 13 October 2015 the Scrutiny Management Panel allocated the review of community safety to the TECS scrutiny panel. The review is ongoing.

In relation to complex cases of anti-social behaviour, the panel is aiming to identify ways that services could work more effectively together to 1) manage individuals with complex needs 2) reduce demand, 3) encourage residents to self-help and 4) intervene earlier to avoid cases becoming increasingly difficult to resolve.

Health, Overview & Scrutiny Panel

Over the last 12 months, the panel scrutinised regular updates from local NHS organisations and Portsmouth City Council. It also looked at:

- The provision of HIV medication
- Congenital heart services review.
- Lowry Unit Project Closure
- Better Care Fund, Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards and the Care Act 2014
- Reconfiguration of vascular services
- Cervical Screening Update
- Dementia Update
- Healthy Weight Strategy and Challenges around Obesity
- Tamarine Respite Care Unit
- Healthwatch Annual Report
- Guildhall Walk Health Care Centre proposals from the CCG

**THIS ITEM IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY
(Please note that "Information Only" reports do not
require Equality Impact Assessments, Legal or
Finance Comments as no decision is being taken)**



- Independent review of deaths of people with a Learning Disability or Mental Health problem in contact with Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust - April 2011 to March 2015.
- Introduction to Integrated Personal Commissioning
- Portsmouth Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report
- Solent NHS Trust - mental health, St James and Baytrees and drug and alcohol pathways in the city
- Repatriation of Vectis Way Phlebotomy Clinic Proposal

.....
Signed by (Director)

Appendices: None

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location

Agenda Item 16



Portsmouth CITY COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING

QUESTIONS FOR THE CABINET OR CHAIR UNDER STANDING ORDER NO 17

CITY COUNCIL MEETING – 12 July 2016

QUESTION NO 1

FROM: COUNCILLOR COLIN GALLOWAY

TO REPLY: LEADER OF THE COUNCIL
COUNCILLOR DONNA JONES

Members have recently moved into their newly allocated offices which offer, for some, a degree of improvement over the previous member's rooms, however, such a move must have incurred considerable costs. Is the Leader able to advise us of those costs and also explain how this move will benefit the Council?

QUESTION NO 2

FROM: COUNCILLOR ALICIA DENNY

TO REPLY: CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURE,
LEISURE AND SPORT
COUNCILLOR LINDA SYMES

Can the cabinet member for culture, leisure and sport tell us what she is doing to recognise the achievements of pioneering woman scientist Hertha Marks Ayrton, who the creators of Google Doodles know about but of whom the citizens of her native city know little or nothing?

QUESTION NO 3

FROM: COUNCILLOR MATTHEW WINNINGTON

**TO REPLY: LEADER OF THE COUNCIL
COUNCILLOR DONNA JONES**

I have been supporting the campaign, including a petition, by local residents to keep the Yomper Statue at the old Royal Marines barracks in Eastney once the Royal Marines Museum moves to the Historic Dockyard. I'm pleased that the Council Leader and Portsmouth South MP Flick Drummond are supporting the campaign too. As the Council's representative on the Royal Marines Museum Trust can the Council Leader please give the council an update on what she has done to try and keep the statue in situ and a commitment that this council will stand with the people of Eastney to keep this icon of Eastney where it belongs.